United Nations S/PV.6804

Security Council

Sixty-seventh year

Provisional

6804th meeting
Wednesday, 11 July 2012, 3.30 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Osorio	(Colombia)
Members:	Azerbaijan	Mr. Mehdiyev
	China	Mr. Hong Ming
	France	Mr. Araud
	Germany	Mr. Berger
	Guatemala	Mr. Rosenthal
	India	Mr. Vinay Kumar
	Morocco	Mr. Loulichki
	Pakistan	Mr. Farooq
	Portugal	Mr. Moraes Cabral
	Russian Federation	Mr. Zhukov
	South Africa	Mr. Mashabane
	Togo	Mr. Menan
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Parham
	United States of America	Mr. DeLaurentis

Agenda

Peace consolidation in West Africa

Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the United Nations Office for West Africa (S/2012/510)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

12-41472 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Peace consolidation in West Africa

Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the United Nations Office for West Africa (S/2012/510)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Mr. Said Djinnit, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Office for West Africa, to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Mr. Yury Fedotov, Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2012/510, which contains the report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the United Nations Office for West Africa.

I now give the floor to Mr. Djinnit.

Mr. Djinnit: I would like to introduce the ninth report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the United Nations Office for West Africa (S/2012/510), covering the period from 1 January to 30 June. In my most recent briefing to the Security Council, on 11 May, I noted that West Africa was confronted with a new wave of challenges to governance, peace consolidation and conflict prevention, as illustrated by the ongoing crises in the Sahel, and especially in Mali and Guinea-Bissau, as well as the overall threat posed by international organized crime and terrorism.

In Mali, the Islamist militant group Ansar Dine and other terrorist groups have taken control of the northern part of the country, with attendant security and humanitarian consequences, including alleged gross human rights violations. This, coupled with the destruction of endangered historical Muslim sites in Timbuktu, is a matter of grave concern to the region and the international community as a whole. Meanwhile, in Bamako, despite the laudable mediation efforts of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), under the leadership of President Ouattara of Côte d'Ivoire and President Compaoré of Burkina Faso, the transitional arrangements, including the adoption of a road map for the election and the restoration of Mali's territorial integrity, have yet to be consolidated.

This situation prompted ECOWAS leaders at their forty-first ordinary session in Yamoussoukro, on 29 June, to fast-track the deployment of the ECOWAS Standby Force Mission in Mali (MICEMA), without prior request or authorization from the Malian authorities. That decision was taken in line with article 25 of the ECOWAS Protocol relating to the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, Resolution, Peacekeeping and Security. The ECOWAS Summit also decided to dispatch a technical assessment mission to Mali to liaise with the transitional authorities to prepare the ground for the deployment of MICEMA. The Summit further called on the transitional authorities to broaden their Government base.

In this connection, I would like to recall that resolution 2056 (2012) of 5 July emphasizes the need to strengthen the legitimacy and security of the Malian transitional institutions. As members of Council are aware, the Malian Prime Minister expressed his opposition to the deployment of an ECOWAS force in Bamako to ensure the security of the transitional institutions. He also expressed reservations regarding the ECOWAS demand for including political and social forces in the Government, while expressing the view that ECOWAS should focus its efforts on assisting Mali to recover its territorial integrity.

The return of interim President Dioncounda Traoré to Mali and the need to ensure his security remain critical to providing constitutional legitimacy to the ongoing efforts to find a way out of the multifaceted crisis faced by the country though the mobilization of an already polarized political class and civil society. These conditions are demanded by the ECOWAS Summit and are echoed in the Security Council resolution.

It is against this background that the ECOWAS Contact Group of Heads of State convened a meeting in Ouagadougou on 7 July with representatives of the Malian political and social forces opposed to the coup d'état, in the presence of a representative of the Malian Government. In my interactions with the ECOWAS leaders on the occasion of these consultations, they

expressed their satisfaction with resolution 2056 (2012), which provided an appropriate framework for their deliberations. Indeed, the consultations offered a unique opportunity to the Malian stakeholders to engage with the ECOWAS leadership on the way forward in the transition. They also helped confirm that some of the decisions taken at the level of ECOWAS Heads of State and Government at their most recent ordinary session in Yamoussoukro, on 29 June, enjoyed broad support among Malian political and civil society actors. That was indeed the case of the need to form a more inclusive and representative Government; the need for ECOWAS military assistance to secure State institutions, reorganize the army and recover territorial integrity; and the need to pave the way for a consensual road map for the transition.

In the course of the discussions, the ECOWAS mediator, President Compaoré, encouraged the participants to give dialogue a chance to achieve territorial integrity. He also disclosed that he had had initial contacts with rebel groups in preparation for talks he intends to facilitate between these groups and a Malian national body that is yet to be established. The leaders seized the opportunity to reiterate their commitment to deploying the ECOWAS Standby Force in Mali.

It is important that the outstanding divergences with the current Government of Mali be resolved in earnest, as they continue to delay the adoption of tangible measures by the Malian stakeholders to address the core issues related to the effective and full restoration of constitutional order, as well as the critical situation prevailing in the north. In moving forward, it is important to remain respectful of the centrality of the Malian institutions and stakeholders and of the leading role played so far by ECOWAS. At the same time, it is equally crucial to stress that the collective dimension further exemplifies the concrete risks to which the region is currently exposed and constitutes a prime demonstration of the deep vulnerability of the Sahel region.

I am confident that the forthcoming African Union summit meetings in Addis Ababa will help in reaching a consolidated African position on the way forward for resolving the crises in Mali and in addressing the situation in the Sahel. Such a common position would inform the much-needed concerted and coordinated efforts on the Sahel, with the support of ECOWAS, the African Union, the United Nations and the broader international community to overcome this complex security, humanitarian and development crisis in the short, medium and long terms.

In this connection, I am pleased to inform the Council that a Dakar-based regional United Nations inter-agency task force has been set up and is currently finalizing the development of an action plan to strengthen the resilience of the countries of the Sahel at the local, national and regional levels. In addition, the United Nations Office for West Africa (UNOWA) and the Dakar-based United Nations agencies will support the development of a comprehensive regional strategy articulating key priorities in the security, political, human rights, humanitarian and development realms in support of the countries of the region, consistent with the Council's demand in resolution 2056 (2012).

Besides the crises in Mali and the Sahel, West Africa continues to face the rapidly evolving phenomenon of piracy and armed robbery at sea in the Gulf of Guinea, which has the potential to significantly impede the economic development of the coastal countries and their landlocked neighbours, as well as to disrupt international maritime routes.

Since the adoption of resolution 2039 (2012), UNOWA has facilitated, together with the United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa (UNOCA), the convening of a meeting in Libreville, on 31 May, that brought together the chief executives of ECOWAS, the Economic Community of Central African States and the Gulf of Guinea Commission. The Libreville meeting launched a planning process for the holding of a summit of the States of the Gulf of Guinea and of a regional anti-piracy strategy. The meeting proved productive in that it confirmed the willingness of the subregional organizations to move forward expeditiously not only to tackle the rise of maritime piracy, but also to act in a joint and coordinated fashion, with the support of the United Nations and other interested international partners. Since then, the first meeting of the technical group in charge of the preparation of a road map and composed of representatives of ECOWAS, the Gulf of Guinea Commission, UNOWA and UNOCA took place in Abuja on 20 and 21 June to pave the way for the preparatory process for the regional summit.

The recent upsurge of violence at the border between Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire, which has caused many civilian deaths as well as the death of seven United Nations peacekeepers from the Niger contingent, also

underlines the continued vulnerability of the Mano River Union. I wish to commend the four-party meeting of representatives of the Governments of Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire, the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) and the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire, held in Abidjan on 13 June. The meeting resulted in a series of decisions, reflecting the need for the Governments of Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire to work closely together to stabilize the common border areas with a view to creating conditions conducive to economic development.

At the same time, efforts need to reach beyond the Côte d'Ivoire-Liberia border nexus and encompass efforts to ensure the lasting stabilization of the Mano River basin as a whole. I would like in this regard to recall the continued commitment of the United Nations to assisting the Governments of the Mano River basin in preserving the hard-won achievements and peace gains of the recent years. In close cooperation with the United Nations peace missions in the region, ECOWAS and the Mano River Union, UNOWA has initiated a process aimed at improving coordination and reinforcing initiatives already under way to face the threats posed by mercenaries, the movement of armed groups and weapons, and their impact on population movements, which continue to undermine the already fragile security of border areas of the subregion.

Regional actors will also need to redouble their efforts to tackle the scourge of drug trafficking and organized crime, which, if not addressed in a timely and effective manner, has the potential to seriously undermine governance and security in the region, as illustrated by the reported growing activities and influence of drug-trafficking networks in Guinea-Bissau, especially since the recent coup in that country.

Following my early engagement with the new leadership of the ECOWAS Commission, we undertook to revitalize the implementation of the 2008-2011 ECOWAS Regional Action Plan to Address the Growing Problem of Illicit Drug Trafficking, Organized Crime and Drug Abuse in West Africa, including through the West Africa Coast Initiative. In that connection, the recent decision by ECOWAS heads of State, at the Summit in Yamoussoukro, to renew their commitment and reactivate and expedite the implementation of the 2009 ECOWAS regional plan of action is an encouraging step that should be commended. I was also encouraged by the great concern shown and commitment demonstrated by the African heads of security whom I addressed on 25 June at their regular meeting in Algiers on the challenge for security posed by drug trafficking and organized crime.

Greater coordination of strategies, as well as the provision of adequate technical and financial resources, will continue to be required to assist the countries and organizations of West Africa in eradicating the activities of drug cartels and other criminal networks. Together with my colleague Mr. Fedotov, I will continue to advocate with major partners, such as the European Union and the United States, for more timely and substantive efforts to help overcome this threat, which has a direct impact on law enforcement agencies and, in the end, undermines State institutions, as demonstrated by the ongoing situations in Guinea-Bissau and Mali.

Finally, I wish to emphasize the importance of continuing to spare no efforts to prevent elections-related tension and violence in West Africa. The consolidation of Senegal's democratic experiment provides reasons for hope and continues to resonate in the subregion and beyond. At the same time, a number of worrying signs are emanating from some countries in West Africa where elections are soon to be held. In that context, it will be key to continue to impress upon the leadership of those countries the need to create the conditions conducive to peaceful and credible elections through genuine dialogue between the Government, the opposition and civil society.

Allow me to conclude by stressing that significant progress has been made over the past years towards the promotion and consolidation of peace, thanks to the initiatives undertaken by the leaders of the region with the support of the continent and the international community, in particular the United Nations. Despite that progress, the security situation in West Africa remains precarious and reversible, as the root causes of instability are yet to be fully addressed. The continued attention and support of the United Nations remains critical.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Djinnit for his comprehensive and informative briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Fedotov.

Mr. Fedotov: I would like to thank the Security Council for the opportunity to update it on the threats posed by drugs and organized crime in West Africa.

With increased drug trafficking, signs of drug production, growing drug consumption, piracy and insecurity, West Africa represents one of the key challenges for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), and it continues to be one of our main priorities. Illicit drugs and transnational organized crime are undermining stability in the region and affecting health, democracy and economic development.

In 2011, approximately 30 tons of cocaine were trafficked in West Africa. However, only 2.7 kilograms were reported seized, in Guinea-Bissau, during the same period. Cocaine trafficking in the region is estimated to generate approximately $900 million in profits annually for criminal networks. In addition, there has also been an increase in heroin trafficking. UNODC reported 20 kilograms seized in 2008, 210 kilograms in 2010 and almost 400 kilograms in 2011. Recently, methamphetamine laboratories have also been discovered in West Africa.

UNODC is continuing to analyze the overall situation. A Threat assessment for the region, emphasizing the trans-Atlantic route for cocaine, will be issued later in the year. But let me be clear: West Africa is no longer simply a transit route for cocaine from Latin America to Europe; it has also become a final destination. There are now up to 2.3 million cocaine drug users in West and Central Africa, with the majority reported in West Africa. That means a greater need for prevention and treatment of drug users, particularly injecting drug users, as well as a focus on HIV/AIDS.

Drug money is also being reinvested in the region to feed all sorts of criminal activities and illicit trafficking. There is also a growing threat of piracy in the Gulf of Guinea, where 36 pirate attacks were recorded in 2010, 49 in 2011 and, to date, 16 in 2012. A United Nations assessment mission, mandated by resolution 2018 (2011) to support Benin was co-led by UNODC and the Department for Political Affairs (DPA) in November 2011. As a follow-up, UNODC will address piracy and maritime security as part of a national integrated programme for Benin.

UNODC is also carefully monitoring terrorism in the region, which has the capacity to destabilize countries such as Mali. As Ambassador Djinnit has said, today the northern part of that country is under the control of terrorist and criminal groups. That could further lead to the deterioration of security and good governance in the region. We are closely reviewing possible links between terrorism and transnational organized crime. UNODC fully supports the Council's endorsement of the mediation efforts of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). If successful, we will be able to restart our operations in that country, after they were suspended following the coup d'état.

The situation in Guinea-Bissau remains a serious concern for UNODC. There are fears over the connections between elements of the military forces and illicit drug trafficking, and there is a prevailing culture of impunity hindering effective law enforcement activities.

In the face of all those challenges, UNODC is building political commitment through regional platforms, especially ECOWAS, developing inter-agency approaches and delivering solutions through its integrated regional programmes. The West Africa Coast Initiative (WACI) offers technical assistance in law enforcement, border management and justice reform, among other areas. Under WACI, we are working at the field level with DPA, the United Nations Office for West Africa, including closely with Ambassador Djinnit, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, INTERPOL and the World Customs Organization (WCO). That is allowing us to combine our mandates and create multidisciplinary responses.

I also welcome the renewal of the ECOWAS regional plan of action. UNODC will continue to assist Member States in confronting those transnational issues.

The ECOWAS Commission has a pivotal role to play in building commitment among Member States, as well as in promoting sustainable reforms.

In the area of inter-agency activities, UNODC is currently drafting, with DPA, the Secretary-General's report on the impact of transnational organized crime in West Africa and the Sahel region, as requested by the Council.

The United Nations Task Force on Transnational Organized Crime and Drug Trafficking, established by the Secretary-General in 2011, is also promoting inter-agency collaboration and joint actions. UNODC is working with the Peacebuilding Commission to help to mainstream drugs and crime as a threat to peacebuilding across the region.

In the area of operations, our network of prosecutors against organized crime in Central America, which was set up in 2011, will soon be partnered with a similar network in West Africa.

The Global Container Control Programme, which UNODC co-manages with the WCO, now operates on both sides of the Atlantic and is supported by a similar programme at the region's airports.

We have also established transnational crime units in Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea-Bissau.

Through those initiatives, we are building judicial and forensic capacity and, significantly, the ability to intercept money being laundered.

West Africa faces complex challenges that represent a severe test for the individual countries and for the region as a whole. Our aim must be to help countries sustain their development, while also ensuring peace and prosperity in the region. To achieve that, UNODC will continue to work with all partners to build the commitment and develop the necessary solutions in this extremely fluid and fast-moving environment.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Fedotov for his briefing.

I now invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion of the subject.

The meeting rose at 4 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.6805

Security Council

Sixty-seventh year

Provisional

6805th meeting
Thursday, 12 July 2012, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Holguín Cuéllar	(Colombia)
Members:	Azerbaijan	Mr. Mehdiyev
	China	Mr. Li Baodong
	France	Mr. Araud
	Germany	Mr. Wittig
	Guatemala	Mr. Rosenthal
	India	Mr. Vinay Kumar
	Morocco	Mr. Loulichki
	Pakistan	Mr. Haroon
	Portugal	Mr. Moraes Cabral
	Russian Federation	Mr. Pankin
	South Africa	Mr. Mashabane
	Togo	Mr. Menan
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Ms. Rice

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70)

Note verbale dated 2 July 2012 from the Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2012/511)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

12-41659 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70)

Note verbale dated 2 July 2012 from the Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2012/511)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Under rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representatives of Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Egypt, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland and Tunisia to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Rwanda, to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Mr. Joachim von Amsberg, Vice-President and Head of Network Operations, Policy and Country Services of the World Bank, to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Thomas Mayr-Harting, Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2012/70, which contains the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session. I also wish to draw the attention of members to document S/2012/511, which contains a note verbale dated 2 July 2012 from the Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

I welcome the presence of the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and invite him to take the floor.

The Secretary-General: I commend Colombia's initiative to convene this timely debate, and I thank the Foreign Minister of Colombia for taking the time to preside over this meeting.

The international community has long recognized the challenging and multidimensional character of the transition from conflict to sustainable peace and development. Security Council mandates have grown in scope. Our field missions now perform an unprecedented variety of tasks. We have increasingly integrated the various efforts carried out under the United Nations flag, and we have come to understand that we can succeed only if we work in close partnership with other key international actors, in support of nationally owned priorities.

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and the Peacebuilding Support Office were established in 2005 to reinforce ongoing efforts on the ground in conflict-affected countries. Yet questions remain as to the focus and effectiveness of these bodies. Two years after the mixed review of the peacebuilding architecture, we are seeing signs that it has begun to come of age and is making a difference. This is the case particularly in those instances when the Peacebuilding Commission, Fund and Support Office reinforce each other and work hand in hand with the United Nations presence on the ground.

In Liberia, for example, the Peacebuilding Commission and Fund have worked closely with United Nations actors on the ground to strengthen existing field efforts in the area of security sector and justice reform. This collective engagement is helping to establish the first of five regional justice and security hubs, which are critical elements of our transition strategy for the United Nations Mission and Liberia.

In Sierra Leone, the PBC and PBF have been supporting efforts to deepen democracy. Over the course of five years, this work has evolved from strengthening State institutions, through the establishment of anti-corruption and human rights commissions, to empowering non-State actors.

In Guinea, after more than 50 years of dominance by the military, the country has moved towards democratic rule and we are supporting the crucially important step of conducting a military census and providing a retirement programme for 4,000 military personnel.

But of course, much remains to be done. Let me highlight three areas in which we can enhance the impact of our peacebuilding tools.

First, the PBC should do more to leverage its unique membership and collective ability to mobilize resources. Through distinct messages that complement those of others, the Commission can reinforce the efforts of national actors, Member States, and the United Nations family at Headquarters and on the ground.

Secondly, the PBC should sustain the focus on longer-term peacebuilding. The Commission's contribution can be particularly valuable in galvanizing international commitment beyond the limited lifespans of United Nations missions on the ground.

Thirdly, the PBC may be able to add significant value in some non-mission settings, where national authorities and Resident Coordinators would benefit from the intergovernmental support that the Commission can bring to bear. In order for the PBC to fully meet its potential, the Security Council should offer greater clarity on what type of advice it would like from the Commission in its deliberations and in the definition of mandates. That would help lead United Nations departments and actors in the field to coordinate with the Commission, and reduce the risk of duplication.

The United Nations is committed to maximizing the potential of the Peacebuilding Commission and the wider peacebuilding architecture. Assisted by the Support Office and in synergy with operational lead entities, the Commission's impact in the field can be further amplified. The United Nations is also working to enhance our cooperation with the international financial institutions, including the World Bank and the African Development Bank. We are also committed to supporting the new model of partnership between fragile and conflict-affected countries and their development partners, as envisaged last year by the g7+ countries and their partners in the New Deal on Engagement in Fragile States.

But we need the support of Member States, including for the Peacebuilding Fund. The PBF has proven itself as a timely and flexible financing instrument when peacebuilding needs are most acute and when few other resources are available for early post-conflict interventions.

As I outlined in my action agenda for my second term, supporting nations in transition is a top priority and generational opportunity for the United Nations. We have much work ahead of us. But if the United Nations family, Member States and the wider multilateral system work together in support of nationally owned strategies, we can have an impact far greater than any single entity could achieve on its own. That is what we owe the peoples we serve. We look forward to deepening that work together.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

I now give the floor to Mr. Gasana.

Mr. Gasana: I am pleased to present the report (S/2012/70) of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on its fifth session.

We have come a long way in appreciating the imperative of complementing the investment in peacemaking and peacekeeping with a long-term vision for sustainable peace. Today, we know that peacebuilding is more than a set of activities and tasks to be mandated, undertaken and reviewed. Peacebuilding is, rather, a state of mind — a culture of policymaking, planning, funding and implementing activities in post-conflict settings. Today, we know that peacebuilding is a term used to describe the continuum that spans all efforts to lay the foundations for sustainable development and for resilient societies and institutions. Today, we have a platform that could help the United Nations and the international community to conceive such a long-term vision for peace and to sustain attention on critical priorities. Today, we have the PBC, whose full potential we have yet to tap.

During the reporting period under review today, the PBC responded to the request for advice and support from the Republic of Guinea, thereby becoming the sixth country to be placed on the PBC's agenda. The decision taken by the Commission to respond positively

to Guinea's request for advice marked a new phase in the evolution of the PBC. This is a country that has not emerged from an armed conflict, is not on the agenda of the Council and has no mandated mission deployed to it. In Guinea, the PBC is up for a new challenge to support the country in a crucial political and socio-economic transition phase.

In the other five countries on the Commission's agenda — Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and Sierra Leone — the PBC has continued to support each country through the different stages and challenges facing the peacebuilding processes.

The reporting period also included the Commission's initial effort to respond to the resolution 1947 (2010), concerning the outcome of the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. At the beginning of the year, the Commission adopted a road map of actions as an implementation framework to take forward relevant recommendations emanating from the review, with special emphasis on enhancing the Commission's impact in the field.

Allow me to highlight just three elements from the annual report before us today.

First, the report underscores the activities undertaken by the Commission's various configurations to reach out to and engage a number of critical actors within and outside the United Nations. In view of the complexity of peacebuilding challenges and the multiplicity of actors, the need for coherence and partnerships cannot be overemphasized. Building and strengthening partnerships with relevant actors has been identified as a key area of potential added value for the Commission. In that regard, the PBC devoted the majority of its effort and time to engaging with the international financial institutions, especially the World Bank and the African Development Bank. In the particular case of the African Development Bank, the reporting period laid the foundation for a deep and diverse partnership that promises to align the Commission's and the Bank's engagement in the countries on the agenda.

Secondly, the Commission has an enormous capacity to promote knowledge and experience-sharing. To that end, the Government of Rwanda, together with the PBC and in collaboration with the African Development Bank, hosted a high-level meeting on the theme "Post-conflict peacebuilding: the experience of Rwanda", held in Kigali on 8 and 9 November 2011. The event represented an innovative effort by the Commission to serve as a platform for promoting experience-sharing between the six countries on its agenda and other countries that have undergone peacebuilding and State-building processes. There is a real need to nurture that type of cooperation among the countries of the South. The PBC is best suited to become a platform for such cooperation.

Thirdly, the Commission has continued to prioritize the need for strengthening the interaction with, and its advisory role vis-à-vis, the principal organs of the United Nations. Briefings by the Chairs of the country-specific configurations to the Security Council have become systematic ahead of the Council's periodic consideration of the situations in, and mandate involving, the countries on the Commission's agenda. The year 2011 also witnessed the introduction by the Council of the informal interactive dialogues on certain country situations.

The 2010 review particularly highlighted the potential for developing a dynamic linkage between the Commission and the Council. Fourteen out of the 15 members of the Security Council are currently members of the PBC in its various configurations. The joint membership offers a natural interface that would facilitate the Council's drawing more proactively and regularly on the Commission's advice. I would like to echo the Secretary-General's point on the need for clarity from the Council regarding the specific areas for which the PBC's advice could be sought.

The reporting period also witnessed the continuing development of the Commission's relationship with the Economic and Social Council. The jointly organized special event on the Millennium Development Goals in countries emerging from conflict testified to the Commission's growing advocacy role for an integrated approach to peacebuilding, including through a well-deserved focus on the socio-economic dimension of peacebuilding.

There is need to empower the PBC to become the central United Nations platform for support to countries emerging from conflict and aspiring to sustained engagement as they undertake the arduous task of building national capacity and institutions. The challenge facing the Commission in demonstrating its full potential, however, is to ensure that its work in support of these countries is backed by a high degree of political commitment from the Member States and

the senior United Nations leadership. This is our shared responsibility and one that we are yet to shoulder with full commitment.

As noted by the co-facilitators of the 2010 review report, "the review should become a wake-up call to strengthen the collective resolve to deal with peacebuilding in a more comprehensive and determined way" (S/2011/41, para. 107). I hope that today's debate will take us a step further towards realizing the full potential of the Commission.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Gasana for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Momen.

Mr. Momen: In just over six years, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), with valuable support from the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), has helped to generate a much-needed focus on the complex challenges of post-conflict peacebuilding. As the Secretary-General rightly noted, while its full potential is yet to be realized, the architecture has started to demonstrate signs of what it is capable of doing. The 2010 review indeed contributed to renewing our commitment to strengthening the architecture and ensuring that it can meet its full potential.

At the outset, I wish to recognize the constructive role played by the Chairs of the respective PBC configurations. Drawing on their experience of working with the countries on the agenda and in the field, their inputs to this statement have been invaluable.

As indicated in the PBC's annual report (S/2012/70) and in the concept paper prepared by the presidency for this debate (S/2012/511, annex), there is need for better understanding of the nature and scope of the Commission's role. Faced with diverse expectations and challenges, the PBC will certainly benefit from a common articulation of its real potential and limitations. This debate represents an opportunity that should be fully utilized. I shall therefore begin on a very frank note.

As an intergovernmental body that is dedicated to addressing the special needs of countries emerging from conflict, the PBC was conceived around the imperative of ensuring the commitment of a broad range of the most relevant global actors. These actors include its own members, which are drawn from the membership of the three principal organs and from the top financial and troop and police contributors to the United Nations. They also include institutional donors and regional actors. This unique membership structure suggests that the PBC could leverage the collective political, financial and technical capacities of its member States and institutional partners in support of national peacebuilding objectives in the countries on its agenda.

In contrast to these expectations, the Commission's engagement has been too frequently defined by the individual efforts made by the leadership of the country configurations and, in rare instances, by a few interested members. The full potential of such a unique political platform, made up of the most influential global actors, has unfortunately not been met. This is a statement that invites serious reflection.

At the same time and despite those difficulties, the PBC has still managed to show signs of its vast potential in the area of political accompaniment and advocacy. To name but a few examples, it has been able to confer legitimacy upon serious national and United Nations efforts to build trust between political actors in the case of Sierra Leone in 2009; manage tensions accompanying electoral processes in Burundi in 2010; support national capacity development for police and the rule of law in Liberia since 2011; support security sector reform in Guinea, leading notably to the completion of the largest military retirement project in the country's history in late 2011; and provide effective support to the first round of presidential elections in Guinea-Bissau last March.

The partnership with the international financial institutions is also an area in which the PBC has demonstrated signs of potential. The most recent completion of the new poverty reduction strategies in Burundi and the Central African Republic offered an opportunity to strengthen the United Nations partnership with the World Bank and the African Development Bank and to integrate peacebuilding priorities into socio-economic planning and programming for both countries. In the case of Guinea-Bissau, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have supported a significant debt relief, helping to generate a virtuous economic cycle in the country. In the case of Guinea, the World Bank is partnering with the Government and other peacebuilding stakeholders to launch a productive social safety nets project that will provide employment to 24,000 young people and women.

Last year's Kigali high-level meeting demonstrated the PBC's potential to facilitate South-South and triangular cooperation in critical and recurring peacebuilding priorities, such as aid and donor coordination, national reconciliation, reintegration, job creation, and security sector and justice reform.

It is difficult to imagine how the international community and the United Nations will be able to tap into this potential in the absence of the political commitment of individual Governments, and the United Nations system as a whole, to render the PBC's efforts successful. The United Nations and other partners should view the PBC as an opportunity and a source of support, not as a competitor or an additional layer of bureaucracy.

At the same time, the PBC must also make great effort to enhance its stature and added value. We must continue to refine and adapt the Commission's instruments and forms of engagement to changing needs and circumstances at the country level; strengthen linkages with the United Nations leadership and other key actors in the field and at Headquarters; explore practical approaches to facilitating resource mobilization; and develop ways of assessing peacebuilding progress. In accomplishing these objectives, the PBC needs the continued and increased support of the PBSO and other relevant United Nations and non-United Nations actors engaged in peacebuilding.

It is significant that this debate on the potential and limits of the PBC is taking place under the auspices of the Security Council, as one of the two parent institutions of the Commission, along with the General Assembly. Given the fact that the Security Council is facing an ever-increasing number of situations to cope with, the PBC can play a useful role in alleviating the Council's workload by looking after situations that are not on its immediate agenda. We thus look forward to innovative ideas and suggestions from Council members. In the meantime, allow me to share a few preliminary ideas suggested by the Chairs group that could provide a framework for strengthening and taking forward these relations.

First, the relations between the Security Council and country-specific configurations should be further intensified and institutionalized. Such a relationship could manifest itself most importantly when the Council is in the process of establishing or renewing the mandate for a country under PBC consideration. Council resolutions could also include specific requests for advice from the PBC around the priority areas identified with the country concerned. This would help the Council to receive more focused analysis on issues ranging from the linkages between security and socio-economic development, the alignment of key actors behind national priorities, the opportunities for connection with relevant global initiatives, and the status of partnerships between the United Nations and other relevant actors in the country concerned.

Secondly, I share the Secretary-General's belief that the PBC would benefit from clarity on the division of roles and responsibilities with the senior United Nations leadership in the field. Such clarity would facilitate the establishment of mutually reinforcing relations in a manner that would optimize the implementation of Council mandates and allow for developing coherent messages and engagement with national actors. We must assure the senior United Nations leadership in the field that the PBC is committed to supporting their role on the ground and that their cooperation is essential to the work of the Commission.

Thirdly, the advice of the PBC could be most relevant as the Council considers a transition from one form of United Nations engagement to another. This advice is expected to be based on an assessment of progress in national peacebuilding efforts, of the level of support from and commitment of the international community, and of the specific capacities required for the United Nations country team to continue to support long-term peacebuilding efforts in the country concerned.

Fourthly and finally, there is need for periodic information sharing with the Council on country-specific opportunities and risks. This would help the Council to identify areas for which greater buy-in and coherence from the United Nations system and the international community should be sought and attained in a timely manner. The Chairs of the PBC country configurations highly value the opportunity given to them to formally brief the Council on the situation in the countries concerned.

We also commend the initiative taken by certain Council Presidents in organizing interactive informal dialogues on country-specific issues. As an incremental step, for instance, a more systematic and periodic use of the country-specific informal format, possibly on a quarterly basis, needs to be considered. Such regular and substantive exchanges could be of great value to the

Security Council ahead of the Council's field visits to countries on the PBC agenda. They could also focus on thematic and regional issues concerning more than one country-specific configuration, for example emerging threats such as transnational organized crime.

In addition, an annual interactive dialogue on the occasion of the consideration of the PBC's annual report could also address broader systemic issues of mutual interest. We look forward to discussing these and other suggestions in the full membership of the Peacebuilding Commission and in the context of the planned informal dialogue.

It is essential that the countries on the agenda of the PBC not relapse into conflict. Therefore, we must continue to maintain our focus on enhancing the PBC's impact in the field. This impact should be ideally manifested by empowering national actors to own and lead the peacebuilding process and by ensuring that the United Nations and other key actors are positioned to support this endeavour. The PBC will strive to provide hope and facilitate the efforts of the national leadership to achieve sustainable peace and security.

Our goal is also to offer all relevant national actors a fair chance at building resilient societies and institutions. This is undoubtedly a goal shared by the Security Council and the broader membership of the United Nations. This is a goal that can be attained only if we manage to muster the necessary political will and commitment.

In conclusion, I invite us all to take this debate as an opportunity to recommit ourselves to putting the needs and aspirations of the peoples of the countries affected by or emerging from conflict ahead of everything else. I recall that none of the post-conflict, low-income, fragile countries can yet achieve a single Millennium Development Goal, but there is hope that countries that could manage to reduce violence also could produce some of the fastest development gains. Therefore, our commitments must be rock solid and long-term, and we must persevere. With the Council's concerted effort, we will win.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Momen for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Von Amsberg.

Mr. Von Amsberg: I thank the Secretary-General and Ambassadors Momen and Gasana for their leadership in this very important endeavour. I thank you, Madam President, for inviting the World Bank to brief the Council on the progress on the strengthening and deepening partnership with the United Nations to support peacebuilding and development in fragile country situations.

I bring with me today the good wishes from the World Bank President, Mr. Jim Yong Kim, who assumed the presidency just last week. He is very much looking forward to engaging over the next weeks and months closely with all our partners on how to deepen and strengthen our collaboration and, in particular, on how to make our work on the ground in conflict and fragile situations even more effective in the future.

Over the past 20 years, we have seen formidable progress in global poverty reduction, but progress has been uneven. Issues of conflict, fragility and violence are among the biggest obstacles to development. Fragile and conflict-affected States are the furthest from achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

I just want to make a few comments on how the World Bank is scaling up its own efforts to fight poverty and promote development in these particular situations, talk about our rising partnerships, and make a few comments on future developments.

On our own efforts over the past two years, when we prepared the *World Development Report 2011* on conflict, security and development, in very close collaboration with the United Nations, we decided to scale up and intensify our work in conflict and fragile situations. We are now putting into operation that document, which has set us on a new path. We have seen that the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, formed in Busan at the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in November and December 2011, and which was endorsed by about 40, countries embodies some of the same principles of more effective partnerships in support of those partner countries. The New Deal and the *World Development Report 2011* call for the international community to re-examine the way it engages in situations of fragility and conflict.

Challenges facing fragile and conflict-affected countries cannot be resolved on a short-term basis or with partial solutions in the absence of institutions that provide people with security, justice and jobs. The development assistance must support and must go hand-in-hand with peace and State-building goals. We at the World Bank are making four major changes on

how we engage in our work in situations of fragility and conflict.

First, we are doing strategies differently. Our country strategies for fragile and conflict-affected States are now focused on support to peace and State-building goals, directly or indirectly through the programmes we are supporting.

Secondly, we are financing differently. Together with our partners in the International Development Association — the World Bank's fund for the poorest countries — we are developing proposals to simplify, adjust and accelerate the framework for allocating resources to fragile and conflict-affected situations. We also have a State- and Peace-building Fund, which we use as a pilot fund to actually implement the ideas of the *World Development Report 2011* and the New Deal for International Engagement in Fragile States. In fact, aligning financial instruments is critical for all of us in order to ensure coherence in our approaches to working with fragile and conflict-affected situations. We have therefore launched a discussion on how to align the World Bank's State- and Peace-Building Fund with the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund and on how we can learn from each other.

Thirdly, we are operating differently. We are also developing a package of internal reforms to enable more informed risk-taking, more nimble operational responses to changing environments, more hands-on implementation support to partner teams, and new approaches for measuring results.

Fourthly, we are deploying our human resources differently. The g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected States has challenged us by saying that they need more face-time with more senior technology specialists on the ground, working more closely with partners in the United Nations and other agencies. In response, we have created a new centre in Nairobi, the Global Centre on Conflict, Security and Development, and are increasing our staff presence in several conflict-affected countries.

I would like now to turn to the partnership and our work with the Peacebuilding Commission. The New Deal and the g7+ have called for strong national ownership of development and peacebuilding strategies and for the alignment of development partners to support those strategies. To achieve those objectives, we need to see greater coherence across an international aid structure that is often too divided and too stove-piped between development, security and humanitarian and diplomatic assistance. That is where the Peacebuilding Commission can play a fundamental role in bridging some of those gaps, as it has in the past. The regular exchanges that are being promoted between the United Nations, its Member States and the World Bank Board have also been instrumental in bringing about that coherence.

The World Bank has supported the Peacebuilding Commission's work since it was founded, six years ago. It has engaged actively in all of the Commission's country-specific configurations. We have been coordinating our respective efforts well.

The Commission has provided useful inputs and guidance to our country teams. I am also encouraged to see that the Commission's country-specific configurations are working to enhance coordination and coherence on the ground. The suggestions made by Ambassador Momen also offer promising avenues for further enhancing the Commission's impact.

Over the past two to three years, the United Nations-World Bank partnership has continued to grow at both the institutional and the country levels. Our teams are collaborating more than ever to ensure that our strategies are aligned and that we respond in a complementary fashion. We see progress in all of the country-specific configuration areas and in all six countries on the agenda. Ambassador Momen has already mentioned some of the joint initiatives.

In the Central African Republic, we are working with the former Belgian Chair on a common agenda to support the Government and development partners.

In Liberia, we are coordinating our upcoming country assistance strategy with the country-led implementation of the New Deal and the Peacebuilding Commission's efforts led by the Swedish Chair.

In Burundi, we are working hand-in-hand with the Swiss Chair and are jointly supporting the Government in organizing a partners' meeting this fall.

In Sierra Leone, the leadership of the Canadian Chair helped all partners align behind the Agenda for Change, and we are coordinating efforts in the critical area of job creation.

In Guinea-Bissau, the World Bank and the Brazilian Chair joined forces to support the country in reaching the decision point under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative.

In Guinea, as the Ambassador mentioned, we collaborate closely with the Government and the Ambassador of Luxembourg on a number of critical issues, including employment generation, and we are exploring ways to further engage in the area of security sector reform.

The World Bank and the United Nations, along with the European Union, are also strengthening coordination on the framework for post-crisis assessments, as the recent example of the joint assessment in Yemen effectively illustrates.

In addition to the country-level collaboration I mentioned, we have thematic collaboration in a joint platform for coordinating job creation and collaboration in the area of justice and security.

We are also working to more effectively address on-the-ground implementation. The World Bank and the United Nations are finalizing a review of the important Fiduciary Principles Accord, which facilitates implementation by one entity of trust funds managed by the other, in specific post-crisis circumstances. That review will open space for a broader discussion of how the World Bank and the United Nations can collaborate to address operational challenges to implementation on the ground, including increased interoperability, common approaches to risk management and the development of instruments for combined operations.

We are also carrying out a joint review of the United Nations-World Bank collaboration within the 2008 Partnership Framework Agreement to take stock of cooperation and identify priorities going forward.

That brings me to my final point, on future perspectives. We need to continue to strengthen our partnership and alignment of activities in the countries on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda, especially our work on needs assessments and poverty reduction strategies.

We support the recommendations of the annual report to further explore complementary programming between the United Nations, the World Bank and other international actors, where issues of security, justice and development intersect.

It will be most useful to link the relevant recommendations of the *World Development Report 2011*, the review of civilian capacity and the ongoing work of the Peacebuilding Commission. Additionally, the implementation of the New Deal offers fresh opportunities to strengthen our collaboration. Six States that have endorsed the New Deal are also on the agenda of the Commission. The Commission has a role in ensuring the coherence and alignment of international assistance behind the New Deal's implementation.

Better support to peacebuilding requires moving from needs-based approaches towards genuine prioritization. The peace- and State-building goals provide a great starting point for such prioritization by highlighting the issues that States themselves have identified as critical moving forward. The Peacebuilding Commission could be a useful forum in which to explore how the peace- and State-building goals and specific challenges facing conflict-affected countries can be reflected in the post-2015 United Nations Development Assistance Framework.

Delivering results for people living in fragile and conflict-affected situations will require concerted and sustained efforts from all of us. The World Bank is deeply committed to that agenda and looks forward to working closely with all partners around the table.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to thank Mr. Von Amsberg for his briefing and for all the commitment shown by the World Bank.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia.

I would like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for joining us and for his presentation. Likewise, I would like to highlight the statements made by the former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Rwanda, Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana, by the current Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen, and by Mr. Joachim von Amsberg, Vice-President for Operations Policy and Country Services of the World Bank.

The 2005 World Summit reached a milestone when we took on a commitment to give impetus to peacebuilding in post-conflict situations. Within the Organization, the Commission has been given the role of proposing and advising on strategies for post-conflict recovery and of bringing together all the agents involved in resource mobilization. Colombia considers peacebuilding processes to be of vital importance. Peacebuilding constitutes a fundamental stage if countries are to overcome the root causes of a

conflict. We hope that this discussion will contribute to strengthening the Commission towards that end.

We know from experience that there is no substitute for strengthening national institutions and that sustainable results are those supported by national ownership. The generation of local and national capacity and ownership over processes, strategies and policies are indispensable conditions for avoiding a relapse into conflict.

A successful peacebuilding process is the first step towards leaving behind past conflict and confrontation and laying a solid and lasting foundation for a promising future for the population. The main responsibility for successful peacebuilding belongs to Governments and relevant national agents, including civil society.

From the Commission's report (S/2012/70), it is clear that the challenges presented by peacebuilding in post-conflict situations demand an ongoing learning process, bearing in mind that no situations are identical and no formulas can be universally applied. Six years after the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission, the fundamental notion of its mandate is still novel for an international community used to thinking almost exclusively in terms of conflicts and their resolution. For the Security Council, it is also novel to move from a paradigm centred on maintaining international peace and security, in application of Chapter VII of the Charter, towards a vision focused on strengthening national capacity and promoting conditions for sustainable development.

Experience has shown the United Nations that peacekeeping tasks cannot be thought of as separate from post-conflict approaches. The structural strengthening of institutions and of the architecture that allows States to function encompasses both peacekeeping and peacebuilding. The actions of peacekeepers clearly can set solid foundations for early peacebuilding.

Of foremost importance is strengthening national capacities and creating the conditions for countries to regain their full independence and sovereignty, generate development and promote the welfare of their populations. Regional and subregional organizations, more closely acquainted with the challenges faced by a country going through the rebuilding process, play an important role in that process through their vision and leadership. In that regard, it is important to highlight the role of international financial institutions, such as the World Bank, and of regional banks similarly working for recovery and reconciliation and building the social, economic and financial structures of countries in such transition.

The Commission has the potential to create mechanisms and modalities to identify knowledge and lessons learned in matters of technical assistance, and thus to promote South-South cooperation. Likewise, it can help States on its agenda to strengthen their national capacities by coordinating the activities of donors and encouraging transparency and accountability.

We commend the configurations for each country on the Commission's agenda for applying flexible and realistic criteria. Such criteria allow for work on the ground within available capacities and provide existing institutions the time and opportunity to achieve their own results. The Commission and its configurations require the commitment and active participation of all their members. It is important to establish specific objectives through which genuine progress and political support can be achieved.

In that context, visits by the Chairs of the configurations are valuable tools, not only in lending political support to countries on the agenda but also as a channel for dialogue between the various national actors and the United Nations system. We therefore believe that dialogue between the General Assembly and the Peacebuilding Commission must be maintained and deepened. We take note of the channel of communication established through the report of the Chairperson of the Commission to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. In that spirit, Colombia will hold an interactive dialogue with the Security Council, the Commission and the countries on its agenda in order to provide an opportunity to exchange opinions in a frank and dynamic manner, jointly analyse expectations and achievements, and establish realistic objectives.

Deepening peacebuilding means modifying traditional attitudes and adjusting to countries and regions that are ever more autonomous in the international system. That shift in balances of power calls for dialogue and political solutions to issues that have traditionally been addressed through sanctions or confrontation. Nations like ours that understand the difficulty of achieving lasting peace know that, despite the obstacles and challenges, we must believe in the possibility of peace and development for

nations affected by conflicts. We know that the path of peacebuilding road is not an easy one.

Given its experience and the challenges it has overcome, and aware that there are still more to surmount, Colombia believes that we must focus on bringing people hope and offering them a chance for a decent life, moving beyond the circumstances of the past. That can be done through public policies providing, inter alia, for reparation for victims and creating effective mechanisms to promote social and economic development to the benefit of the most vulnerable and affected population. We believe that lasting peace can be achieved through a balance of policies that provide for reparations and that generate sustainable welfare and prosperity in the long term. We must commit ourselves to finding policies that promote consensus, heal the wounds of the past and allow societies — especially younger generations — to rebuild their countries, create opportunities and work towards reconciliation, security and peace.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

I shall now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Ms. Rice (United States of America): I thank you, Minister Holguín Cuéllar, for chairing this important debate. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General, Ambassador Gasana, Ambassador Momen and Mr. Von Amsberg for their important leadership on the issue of peacebuilding.

We have learned time and again that the end of conflict does not mean that peace has necessarily arrived. Sustained peace must be built on a durable foundation of national commitment, broad international support and experience informed by the lessons of the past. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has an important role to play, and can continue to enhance its contribution by focusing its efforts, strengthening coordination with internal and external stakeholders, and highlighting best practices.

First, peacebuilding cannot succeed without national ownership. That is indispensable. Government, civil society and citizens must be engaged regularly in order to ensure the international community responds to their needs. We encourage the PBC to engage affected communities in shaping peacebuilding priorities and to incorporate the perspectives of youth and women in particular, which are crucial to post-conflict recovery.

The Liberia configuration's recent meeting with a local peace committee is one example of grass-roots engagement that should be repeated. Peacebuilding strategies need to be integral to national plans, not an added burden to post-conflict Governments already struggling to manage delicate transitions. The PBC can help reinforce existing national strategies and ensure a focused effort from all actors. The PBC has done that effectively in Sierra Leone by adopting the Government's Agenda for Change as the basis for its engagement in the country. As a result, the PBC promotes a single vision for Sierra Leone's future.

Secondly, the international community still struggles with coordinating an increasingly crowded field of peacebuilding actors. We urge the PBC to forge and expand partnerships with international financial institutions, including the African Development Bank and the World Bank, major donors and key regional actors. Deeper relationships between the PBC and regional organizations, such as the Economic Community of West African States, would also benefit many countries on the PBC agenda, particularly in dealing with issues that benefit from regional solutions, including combating transnational illicit networks.

Thirdly, mobilizing resources for peacebuilding remains an enormous challenge, but one on which the PBC can have a significant impact. We commend the country-specific configuration Chairs for publicly advocating for sustained commitment to peacebuilding and increasing the alignment of PBC priorities with projects supported by the Peacebuilding Fund. The PBC can also leverage its diverse composition and convening power to mobilize new sources of investment and support, including from the private sector, and work to ensure timely and successful donor conferences and related processes.

Fourthly, today's discussion of the PBC's effectiveness cannot be separated from the broader work of United Nations peacebuilding, including efforts to develop and deploy more effectively capable civilian specialists in the aftermath of conflict.

We welcome the commitment of the Secretary-General to implement reforms since the issuance of his report (S/2011/527) on the subject. Those include the development of an online mechanism to access the marketplace of civilian expertise, and

the designation of a new global focal point on the rule of law, to bring greater coherence to the work of the United Nations and mobilize the combined expertise of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations on that critical, cross-cutting issue. Indeed, successful peacebuilding requires the United Nations to pool its own system-wide expertise.

On other multifaceted issues, such as youth employment and improving public sector capacity-building, progress still needs to be made in bringing all partners together around common strategies and effective divisions of labour.

The United Nations can also play a unique role in facilitating triangular partnerships that support the sharing of expertise in post-conflict transitions, such as the initiative of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development to deploy Kenyan, Ugandan and Ethiopian experts to South Sudan, with the support of Norway and UNDP. United Nations agencies can encourage wider use of those and other innovative arrangements when designing peacebuilding activities.

Finally, fortunately, we have an increasingly long list of experiences to inform our support for countries emerging from conflict. The PBC has worked with six countries on a diverse range of peacebuilding needs, and the United Nations has supported numerous other peacebuilding efforts in places such as South Sudan and Timor-Leste.

While there is no one-size-fits-all peacebuilding solution, the United States encourages the PBC, through its Working Group on Lessons Learned, to systematically review peacebuilding precedents and disseminate global best practices from countries on and off the PBC's agenda.

The Council's mandate to advance peace and security demands that we work not just to end conflict, but to prevent its recurrence. By aligning with national priorities, strengthening international partnerships and learning from what we have already accomplished, the Peacebuilding Commission has great potential to help countries emerging from war to stay on the path to peace. The United States looks forward to the Security Council's continuing engagement with the PBC to facilitate and enhance that critical work.

Mr. Menan (Togo) (*spoke in French*): The importance of the debate being held by the Security Council today stems from the fact that peacebuilding remains at the heart of the work of the United Nations. I would therefore like to thank Colombia, Madam President, for deciding to put the issue at the centre of the Council's work for this month.

The annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on the work of its fifth session (S/2012/70) provides an illustration of the actions taken in 2011. The statements just made by the Secretary-General, the current and outgoing Chairs of the Commission and the representative of the World Bank serve to inform the Council about the work carried out and the challenges to be addressed. I congratulate the Chairs of the PBC and its country-specific configurations for their leadership.

Since the 2005 World Summit, peacebuilding has remained at the centre of United Nations efforts in countries emerging from conflict. Peacebuilding supports peacekeeping in order to enhance the effectiveness and visibility of the United Nations presence, which has the task of considering systematically and comprehensively all of the problems due to or exacerbated by an armed conflict, in order to build a viable State that respects fundamental freedoms and establish good political and economic governance.

Since the establishment of the PBC, the Security Council has also worked to develop and adapt its peacekeeping mandates, which now give pride of place to the rebuilding of a country after peace has been restored.

In that context, my country commends the reconstruction work carried out by the PBC country-specific configurations in Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Guinea, the Central African Republic and Burundi. Although the results vary from one country to another, the new approach translates the will of the United Nations to ensure that countries emerging from conflict do not revert to violence due to a lack of appropriate support.

The Commission's report reviews the key actions of the country-specific configurations, which essentially concern establishing dialogue among the various political actors of a country in order to provide solutions to divisive issues, strengthen national capacities in order to establish a solid foundation for development and mobilize external resources to rebuild the country and foster strengthened coordinated efforts among the various development agencies aimed at consolidating real accomplishments.

It is comforting to note that many sectors of the concerned countries have experienced accelerated development resulting from the initiatives of the country configurations, which have established dialogue among the various actors participating in reconstruction and targeted priority tasks.

Among the priority actions, Togo believes that there should be emphasis on political dialogue among the various actors in a country, so as to ensure that the settlement of political issues will open a path towards democracy while establishing the rule of law and good governance and reforming the key sector of justice.

Nevertheless, Togo would recall that to ensure the long-term success of those actions it is important to continue to prioritize the participation of women and youth in all future initiatives.

The PBC's support for Liberia, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone and Guinea in West Africa with respect to their development programmes indicates that the issues of youth and women's employment, drug trafficking and security sector reform were particularly targeted because settling those issues is essential to the stability and sustainable development of those countries.

Turning to the issue of transnational organized crime in West Africa, we are pleased by the cooperation among the four country configurations, which have joined efforts to respond to the problem comprehensively based on the principle of common and shared responsibility, along with assistance from exterior actors.

In that regard, the call for cooperation among the PBC, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and INTERPOL deserves support, not only in order to implement the relevant ECOWAS action plan, but also the West Africa Coast Initiative. In each case, it should be noted that awareness-raising, political support and resource-mobilization are key elements of the activities to be conducted.

While congratulating the PBC for its policy on mobilizing resources, we encourage it to strengthen efforts in that area. External financing should assist national authorities to cover all sectors, rather than targeting only a few areas, such as governance, justice sector reform, the preparation of elections and security sector reform.

In that context, my delegation commends the good cooperation established with such international financial institutions as the World Bank, the African Development Bank and other funds and programmes, which all participate in peacebuilding in their own way and according to their own capacities.

In spite of all of those efforts and the encouraging results achieved on the ground, much remains to be done. Other actions and initiatives should be taken to improve the performance of the PBC and the country-specific configurations. Togo believes that the Commission would provide added value in attracting greater appreciation if it were to synchronize cooperation and direct exchanges with local actors and their partners.

By visiting the field more often and meeting not only country authorities but national and international actors and other concerned United Nations bodies, the PBC would be able to see for itself what actions are needed to strengthen its action in the field. Such cooperation would have the added benefit of harmonizing the efforts under way with a view to avoiding duplication. In that respect, the Chair of the PBC should be given the opportunity to join the Security Council on its field missions when needed.

In the same vein, national ownership of development programmes provides another opportunity for the work of the United Nations to succeed in countries where it is involved. This involves, in particular, training for local stakeholders. In order to properly carry out its reconstruction mission, the PBC should also rely on subregional organizations, which have the advantage of knowing the fundamental needs of the people, with particular emphasis on the energy and basic development sectors.

Togo also believes that national reconciliation should be a major focus in efforts to ensure lasting peace. Even if reconciliation is based on the application of justice, the Commission should promote a justice that repairs and restores. In that respect, truth, justice and reconciliation commissions should be supported and encouraged, because they offer true reconciliation after having established the facts, determined who was responsible and provided reparations to the victims.

To conclude, Togo calls once again for greater support from Member States and all competent organizations for the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office.

Mr. Pankin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Allow me to thank Secretary-General Ban

Ki-moon, the Permanent Representatives of Rwanda and Bangladesh and the representative of the World Bank, who have shed light on developments in peacebuilding and on problems and prospects in that area.

Peacebuilding assistance is one of the key factors for the effective settlement of conflicts and the stabilization of post-conflict situations, as well as for avoiding a relapse into crisis. This is especially clear in light of the recent events in the Middle East and the new wave of instability in a number of States on the African continent.

Against this backdrop, today's meeting on the issue of peacebuilding is, in our view, a most timely initiative, and we expect that we will have a candid and comprehensive discussion. We welcome Mrs. María Ángela Holguín Cuéllar, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia.

Within the framework of United Nations peacekeeping missions, peacebuilding offices and the country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), significant peacebuilding work is being carried out. This activity is difficult and challenging. It requires the coordinated efforts of Member States, United Nations programmes and funds, regional entities, the United Nations Secretariat and international financial institutions.

At the same time, we see that international assistance in this field remains fragmented. There is a need for increased coordination in the division of labour among the relevant stakeholders, and the effectiveness of existing financing mechanisms must be enhanced. Solving those problems will require the close attention of Member States. It will also require the systematization of peacebuilding processes, including by harmonizing the work of the existing United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The Russian Federation supports the activity of the Peacebuilding Commission. The main added value of this body, in our view, lies in its coordinating role in peacebuilding and in the provision of valuable advice to the Security Council, upon its request, regarding States on its agenda. We would like to convey our gratitude to the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, for his statement and for his first six months of effective leadership of the Commission. We expect that the proposals that he has spelled out, which were drafted jointly with the chairs of the country-specific configurations, will subsequently be carefully considered by the entire Commission.

Regarding the PBC's work as a whole thus far, and despite the time that has passed since 2005, we must note that a great deal remains to be done to optimize the effectiveness of its work. In that respect, we are convinced that the PBC's current mandate and its unique intergovernmental nature and structure are all in keeping with its intended role as a key body in the coordination of peacebuilding assistance.

Serious work is being carried out within the framework of country-specific configurations, and here the PBC's main merit lies in engaging in direct dialogue with Governments, guaranteeing their leading role and ownership of the peacebuilding process as well as determining and setting out the main needs on the ground.

The country-specific configurations are a unique opportunity for cooperation with all peacebuilding stakeholders, both in the field and in New York. This includes United Nations structures, regional organizations, financial institutions and bilateral donors. Information on assistance should be aggregated, analysed and, most importantly, discussed in an intergovernmental format. The result would, in our view, be useful both to the PBC itself for the elaboration of recommendations for various States on its agenda and to the Security Council in making decisions on individual States.

The reverse process is necessary as well. The Commission must relay information on peacebuilding priorities, on existing shortcomings in peacebuilding assistance and on the duplication of efforts to entities working in the field.

The PBC, within the framework of its mandate, should also make a contribution to resolving important cross-cutting issues related to peacebuilding and the United Nations system as a whole and which require multifaceted comprehensive discussions with Member States within the framework of the main bodies of the United Nations.

Currently, one such topic is civilian capacity-building. Training reserves of national civilian experts has become one of the most important fields of assistance to post-conflict States. After all, it is to resolve peacebuilding tasks, to provide assistance in rebuilding State institutions, law enforcement and

other structures shaken by conflict that civilian experts are sent to post-conflict States. The unique composition of the PBC and its country-specific configurations enables it to lend this process a high profile and a genuinely intergovernmental dimension and to utilize the South-South and trilateral cooperation mechanisms.

In practice, and despite the efforts of individual components of the Commission, it has not always been possible for the Commission to achieve harmony, even in its own work. As is often said, the right hand is simply unaware of what the left hand is doing. The organizational committee therefore needs a clear picture of what is going on in the country-specific configurations, just as a thread is needed to stitch together the various configurations.

The procedure for the preparation and taking of decisions in the configurations needs to be fine-tuned and the process of determining priorities for the activities of the Peacebuilding Fund and Peacebuilding Support Office must be made more transparent for PBC member States. Many of these problems can be resolved through technical fine-tuning, including the reorganization of working methods, especially as the roadmap for the Commission's work for this year contains the issue of working methods as a priority.

We would like to touch on an important component of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, namely the Peacebuilding Fund. This mechanism for emergency financing, which promotes the attraction of long-term resources for reconstruction and development, has proven its effectiveness. For this reason, the Russian Federation continues to contribute $2 million to the Fund annually. The provision of assistance through the Peacebuilding Fund on the basis of programmes and projects elaborated by Governments and the United Nations duly takes into account the priorities of the host country and fosters a responsible approach to using such assistance. It is gratifying that over half of the Fund's resources are allocated to States on the PBC's agenda. We continue to base our actions in that regard on the priority given to the country principle in the allocation of resources.

Mr. Mehdiyev (Azerbaijan): At the outset, I should like to thank the Colombian presidency of the Security Council and you personally, Madam Minister, for convening and presiding over this long-awaited debate on the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on its fifth session (S/2012/70). Today's open debate provides an excellent opportunity for the Council members and the wider United Nations membership to exchange views on the important role that the Commission plays in advancing the United Nations peacebuilding efforts, and to assess progress and challenges.

I also thank the Secretary-General, the former and current Chairs of the Commission, and Mr. Joachim von Amsberg for their briefings and statements. Let me also emphasize the dedicated work of the Chairs of the country-specific configurations. We are looking forward to an informal interactive dialogue tomorrow with them, in which we will continue to reflect in a frank and detailed manner on the issues relevant to the United Nations peacebuilding efforts.

Azerbaijan has aligned itself with the statement to be delivered later today by the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Post-conflict peacebuilding does not exist in a vacuum and is dependent on a number of underlying principles. First of all, the peacebuilding process can take root and succeed only if a genuine peace, based on the norms and principles of international law, is established on the ground. Peacebuilding must not be directed at sustaining the status quo created as a result of the violation of international law. It should not be used as a tool to consolidate illegal solutions based on faits accompli.

Secondly, the Governments of countries emerging from conflicts bear the primary responsibility for peacebuilding, including for identifying their own needs and setting up national development agendas. The international community should fully respect the sovereignty, independence and national development choices of countries, and the United Nations should play the role of coordinator of international efforts and mobilizer of international resources to assist countries in formulating and advancing their national strategies.

Thirdly, peacebuilding can be truly effective only if it strives to build the national institutional capacities of post-conflict countries to sustain peace and stability. Solid national capacities and strong national ownership are key prerequisites that underpin the continuity and sustainability of peacebuilding.

Speaking of national ownership in peacebuilding, we would like to stress that in certain situations in which some parts of national territory are conflict-affected,

strategic planning and long-term preparation are required for the immediate and smooth rebuilding process to be launched once peace is achieved.

As a country suffering from conflict and foreign military occupation of its territories, Azerbaijan is working hard on the political track to achieve a negotiated settlement based on international law. Although the prospect of a speedy solution still remains elusive, the Government of Azerbaijan long ago started designing strategies and programmes for the social, economic and environmental reconstruction of its territories after their de-occupation. Simultaneously, we are increasing institutional and resource capacities in all spheres to effectively meet our goals. It goes without saying that the engagement of international expertise at the relevant phases of national peacebuilding efforts will be required.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission sought to bring coordination, coherence and integrity to the United Nations peacebuilding efforts with a view to achieving sustainable peace. By virtue of the complexity and heavy dependence of the peacebuilding process on existing circumstances in the field and changing realities globally, the Commission cannot entirely meet expectations across the whole spectrum of activities that fall within the notion of peacebuilding.

The year 2010 marked the first review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. The review laid out a number of ambitious, yet very plausible recommendations aimed at further improving the effectiveness of the Peacebuilding Commission. The Council's subsequent resolution 1947 (2010) provided political ground for all relevant United Nations actors, including above all the Commission, to take forward these recommendations in their activities. Therefore, the Commission's fifth annual report is of particular importance, since it is the first to reflect progress in the implementation of the recommendations set out by the review.

The Commission's road map for actions in 2011 provided a structured approach for the implementation of two overarching recommendations addressed to it by the review, namely, enhancing its impact in the field and strengthening its relations with key actors at Headquarters. Looking at the road map for actions in 2012, we note that this year the Commission, while focusing on further advancing its work in these directions, also recognizes the need to place particular emphasis on improving the effectiveness of its configurations.

Despite being a complex process with a variety of actors and spheres of engagement, peacebuilding constitutes an integrated system and a web of different components, with one complementing and reinforcing another. The success of the Commission's work is inextricably linked to and gauged against the achievements of its configurations on the ground. In other words, the more effective the country-specific configurations become in the field, the more valued and in-demand the Commission will be by Member States. In this regard, further strengthening the role of the country-specific configurations, as recommended by the 2010 review, could bring qualitative improvements to the effectiveness of the Commission's work and to the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

Mr. Haroon (Pakistan): It is a great pleasure to welcome you to the Security Council, Madam, and we should like to thank you for coming because, with your being here, we find that we have the opportunity to discuss the matter of peacebuilding and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), which otherwise has been pending for a longer time than many of us would care to remember. I think that it is a good omen to see you here.

We are grateful to the Secretary-General for his statement.

I would like to commend the Permanent Representative of Rwanda for ably guiding the work of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission, and specifically for presenting the report on the fifth session of the PBC (S/2012/70). I also thank my friend the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, whose is currently Chair of the PBC.

The 2011 session was the first one after the completion of review process in 2010. The process helped realign focus along three key concepts of peacebuilding. First, it created a strict prioritization of targeted areas from among the areas of security sector reform, local capacity-building and economic revitalization. Secondly, it sharpened the emphasis on development aspect of peacebuilding. Thirdly, it refined the peacekeeping-peacebuilding nexus. From this, the conclusion was also drawn that it was imperative to craft and implement peacebuilding strategies according to national priorities and policies, with complete local ownership.

Before I discuss the 2011 report, I should like to say that I find in this three-point focus some disturbing omissions. I find that perhaps we have not focused on these issues as we ought to have. I believe that, at this institution, we must seek a more integrated role for the Commission in order to make it effective.

We note that the 2011 report of the PBC points to progress on implementing the 2010 review. Some aspects of the report have a reference value, such as a record of work and meetings and country-specific configurations. The value of such reports can be enhanced through an analytical explanation — if available — of the decision-making process. Such an analysis must dovetail into enhancing our collective understanding of the various facets of peacebuilding.

Work in the country-specific configurations of the PBC is an important element of the peacebuilding narrative. Our shared understanding of the challenges and complexities of peacebuilding endeavours will improve as respective configurations take forward their work.

I would not be out of place in mentioning here that, when I was looking at the various zones of conflict that are now endowed with some sort of United Nations-inspired peace, I found the number to be far in excess of the countries that are to be reflected here today in speech and/or in the report.

Achievements of the older configurations, such as those for Burundi and Sierra Leone, as well as the challenges faced by them, will offer a useful body of knowledge for application to the emerging new configurations, such as those for Liberia and Guinea. It is important that the work of country configurations is congruent with overall peacebuilding objectives and is carried out under full national ownership. In our recent travels to these areas, we heard the oft-repeated remark of not being included in this process, instead being reported upon. That is a difference that we in this body must understand. Therefore, regular interaction among the Chairs of the country-specific configurations, the Security Council and the Organizational Committee of PBC are critical to ensuring transparency and accountability.

The countries that decide or agree to be placed on the PBC's agenda themselves have a special responsibility to put the concept of their own ownership into practice. Often, they tend to be in great awe of the United Nations and do not do so. I think that it is time for them to lead and guide the discussion from the front, and to frankly present and explain their priorities and expectations to the Commission for it to consider. It is only through their active engagement that we can drive this process forward. In turn, international partners must demonstrate political will and flexibility to respond effectively to nationally owned peacebuilding priorities.

In the general discourse on United Nations conflict management, "peacekeepers are early peacebuilders" is an oft-encountered adage. However, the linkage between peacekeeping and peacebuilding needs to be put in the proper perspective. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding are specialized activities, albeit with a common objective. They should not be subjected to competition for resources. Despite the very generous contribution of some members here and from the General Assembly, the record thus far shows that the funds are by no means commensurate with the peacebuilding process. Without that, they will not really move forward with the three objectives outlined earlier. Given that integrated mandates are increasingly becoming the norm, peacekeeping and peacebuilding tasks should be articulated clearly and adequately resourced from onset of a mission.

Clear articulation of peacebuilding tasks in a mission's mandate necessitates closer interaction between the PBC and the Security Council. Regrettably, that has not happened as it should have. It has been inadequate in whatever has happened so far. The Council must utilize the PBC's advice in framing peacebuilding mandates. The PBC's interaction with principal organs of the United Nations and the international financial institutions will be important as well to moving matters forward.

The success of United Nations peacebuilding hinges on adequate financial resources. The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) has thus far had a catalytic role in harnessing other sources of funding — without adequate success, however. But it is an essential component of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. However, given the magnitude of the challenges, the PBF alone cannot, and was not supposed to, meet the rising overall demands for peacebuilding. Avenues of resource mobilization should therefore be more vigorously explored. I would like to recall that the establishment of the peacebuilding architecture in 2005 was a direct recognition of the interlinkage between peace and development. Unless that aspect is given due attention, success will continue

to elude us in achieving and building durable peace internationally.

Besides financing, peacebuilding initiatives require necessary human resources. In that context, the Secretary-General's initiative on civilian capacity must be called extremely important for identifying expertise that could be tailored to particular needs. We hope that the ongoing follow-up on the civilian capacity process will lead to more efficiency in the field, as well as at Headquarters, where it is missing. Intergovernmental input in the process will grant it the legitimacy it seeks.

The Peacebuilding Commission, with its unique composition and specific mandate, is an important tool for post-conflict stability. We must consider ways and means of better realizing the contribution that its unique composition can make to the collective objective. We hope that the working of the PBC will improve in leaps and bounds as the global narrative on peacebuilding further evolves and as our collective response becomes more focused and, hopefully, more results-oriented.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): I thank you, Madam President, for your attendance at this morning's meeting and for convening this debate. In particular, I am grateful to Colombia for focusing the Council's attention on the important issue of peacebuilding and on the role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We think that this is a very timely debate, especially following the Council's recent visit to West Africa. We thank the Secretary-General, Ambassadors Gasana and Momen and Mr. Von Amsberg for their comprehensive briefings.

Peacebuilding remains a central focus for the United Kingdom. We believe that the Peacebuilding Commission has a potentially important role to play within the wider context of United Nations efforts to support countries emerging from conflict. But, as Ambassador Momen rightly said today, the Peacebuilding Commission has not yet fulfilled that potential.

As Council members will be aware, following our visit to West Africa I wrote to the Council President on 12 June with some ideas on how we might strengthen the role of the PBC in the countries visited, and how we might improve the quality of the interaction between the Council and the PBC Chairs. I am grateful to the Colombian presidency for scheduling an interactive dialogue tomorrow with the relevant PBC country configurations, and for this wider open debate today.

For now, I would like to highlight three areas where we see an important added value for the role of the PBC. They are, first, supporting strong national ownership of peacebuilding; secondly, promoting coherence in international support for peacebuilding; and thirdly, providing informed briefings for the Security Council.

First, on national ownership, as we know, the primary responsibility for peacebuilding rests with post-conflict Governments themselves. That means, as Ambassador Haroon has just reminded us, national leadership and ownership of the process from start to finish. But national leaders should not feel that they are in it alone. The international community has an important role to play by helping post-conflict countries build national capacity to lead, and by helping to strengthen and underpin the political will necessary to consolidate peace.

We do not have to invent this sort of partnership from scratch. A number of conflict-affected countries have come together and produced, after some two years of effort, an agenda for how the international system should partner them as they build peace, based on the core principles of national leadership and ownership. This agenda, the so-called New Deal, is one we should actively support.

The Peacebuilding Commission should be working with the countries on its agenda in line with the principles of the New Deal. That means helping to ensure that national Governments are in the driver's seat and that their leadership is not undermined. But it also means holding national actors to account for their commitment to peacebuilding. The PBC should be a supportive partner, but also a robust one, and should not shirk engaging in discussion about the tough issues and political choices that post-conflict countries face, including, for example, on national reconciliation, the rule of law and human rights.

Secondly, as the Secretary-General and Ambassador Momen highlighted, the coherence of the international effort is absolutely vital. We simply cannot overburden countries emerging from conflict with individual agency turf wars or duplication of effort, or major gaps in support for key peacebuilding sectors. We must ensure that our own efforts as an international community are coherent. This is especially true for the United Nations. We need strong, effective links between United Nations missions and country teams, so that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

That requires good planning, a clear division of labour and strong leadership on the ground. I welcome the fact that the new Deputy Secretary-General has stressed that message in his first few days in his new job.

The PBC can play a vital role here. It can support the countries on its agenda in mapping international assistance, identifying gaps and lobbying international actors to improve coherence and predictability of support. It can even name and shame when international actors are not lining up in support of a coherent, effective international effort. In that regard, the PBC has a critical role to play in bringing to bear the perspective of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, which play such a central role in helping many countries restart their economies in the aftermath of conflict. We warmly welcome the participation of the World Bank in today's debate.

Finally, let me turn to the relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. I believe that the PBC can add genuine value to Council deliberations for the countries on its agenda by complementing the briefings given by senior United Nations officials on the ground. For example, the PBC could provide the Council with an overview of the effectiveness of international support to the countries on its agenda. It can elucidate on the kinds of issues I have talked about today: the coherence, inclusivity and degree of national ownership of peacebuilding in a given country. For its part, the Council could be more direct in requesting specific information from the PBC Chairs, especially in the run-up to consultations or mandate renewals. That would enable the Commission to widen the Council's field of vision across the full range of peacebuilding challenges and actors.

Mr. Li Baodong (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to thank Colombia for its initiative in holding this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, and Foreign Minister Holguín Cuéllar for presiding over today's meeting. I would also like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon; Ambassador Gasana and Ambassador Momen, the Permanent Representatives of Rwanda and Bangladesh, respectively; and Mr. Von Amsberg of the World Bank for their presence.

China greatly appreciates the remarkable achievements of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) last year. As the first entity within the United Nations system in charge of coordinating post-conflict peacebuilding, the PBC has made efforts to implement its mandate, pursuant to the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and has played an important role in advancing peacebuilding in countries emerging from conflict. At the same time, since peacebuilding is a long-term, complex and arduous task, the PBC confronts many challenges in its work. I would like to make the following four comments.

First, the PBC and all relevant parties should fully respect the national ownership of the countries concerned. Post-conflict States bear primary responsibility for building peace in their own countries. In helping such countries to build peace, the Commission should respect their will and try to help them strengthen national capacity-building, including by enhancing their capacity in the areas of civil administration and national governance. The PBC should also proactively strengthen its partnership with the countries on its agenda in a constructive manner.

Secondly, the Commission should help post-conflict countries mobilize the necessary resources in accordance with their national situation and specific priorities. The priorities of post-conflict peacebuilding are stabilizing the security situation, promoting political reconciliation, and strengthening the development of democracy. At the same time, root problems that threaten peace and security, particularly issues of social and economic development, should also be tackled. The PBC should act as an important platform to help coordinate international assistance and mobilization of resources. We also hope that the Peacebuilding Fund will be able to provide greater support for the work of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Thirdly, the Commission should enhance its coordination and cooperation with the chief United Nations entities, international financial institutions and regional organizations. We hope that it will build on its coordination and coherence with such major organs of the United Nations as the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in an effort to explore effective means of assisting post-conflict countries in building peace. The unique advantages in the field of peacebuilding possessed by such financial institutions as the World Bank and by regional and subregional organizations, such as the African Union, should be tapped further in order to achieve more concrete results in peacebuilding among countries emerging from conflict.

Last, but not least, we believe that the PBC should continue to strive to improve its working methods and enhance efficiency. Peacebuilding covers a broad area and involves complex and burdensome tasks. The PBC should continue to improve its internal institution-building, and actively collect experiences and best practices. At the same time, it should put more emphasis on results achieved in the field in specific countries, including using such resources as various United Nations projects, funds and peacekeeping missions, while strengthening coordination and cooperation and avoiding duplication.

Mr. Moraes Cabral (Portugal) (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you, Madam President, for presiding over the Council. It is always an honour and a pleasure to have you with us. I would like to congratulate the Colombian presidency of the Council for having organized this important debate. I should also like to thank you, Madam, for the excellent concept note (S/2012/511, annex) that your delegation prepared.

(*spoke in English*)

I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his important statement, as well as our colleagues from Rwanda and Bangladesh for their very useful briefings and for their leadership. I also wish to say a word of appreciation to Mr. Von Amsberg for his presentation.

Portugal naturally shares the positions that will be presented later during this debate by Ambassador Mayr-Harting on behalf of the European Union.

There is no denying that, over the past six years, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has established itself as a unique actor within the United Nations architecture for post-conflict peace consolidation. The report (S/2012/70) we are considering today testifies to that effect and provides a comprehensive account of how the Commission and its various configurations have evolved and developed new forms of engagement with fragile countries, as well as with the wider donor community. Of course, much can still and should be done.

One distinctive aspect of the PBC that Portugal particularly values is the way it brings together security and development as interrelated elements of peace consolidation. Making sure that those two dimensions are treated in an integrated manner from the early stages of peacekeeping requires bringing our political, development, security and humanitarian instruments into a single consistent framework. In each of the countries where it is involved — including in the four configurations that Portugal is a part of — the PBC certainly contributes to the United Nations effort to devise such a framework.

The PBC's singularity derives also from its membership, which brings together Member States and international organizations, and from its engagement with national actors in the definition of peacebuilding priorities. Its approach, based on mutual engagement between the PBC and the authorities of the countries on its agenda, provides a strong incentive for national ownership of peace consolidation processes.

The issue at stake here today is how to make the best use of those singular features of the PBC in order to ensure a more coherent and effective United Nations presence on the ground, but also greater visibility for the PBC's work. As the annual report indicates, one of the PBC's main tasks is the mobilization of donors' resources and the identification of financing gaps and of the priorities for international assistance. Yet, that should translate into the actual work being carried out on the ground. Besides the regular planning and articulation with national authorities, we strongly believe that the PBC should, early on, be more systematically involved with other actors, first and foremost with United Nations agencies, but also with bilateral partners, international financial institutions and regional organizations. By engaging with the different partners, the PBC can play a very important role in bridging potential gaps between what each actor is doing. In that respect, the partnership established with the African Development Bank is a very positive step, which will hopefully yield concrete results in the near future.

Another crucial aspect is that of political dialogue. The statements of mutual agreement, as well as the visits by the Chairs of the country-specific configurations, constitute excellent opportunities for conveying political messages regarding the situation in the countries on the PBC's agenda. Yet, we must admit that more needs to be done to articulate the political role of the PBC configuration Chairs with that of other United Nations actors, namely, the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, in order to avoid duplication or, even worse, contradictions.

Priority areas for PBC intervention should also be carefully considered, taking into account the

mandate of United Nations missions on the ground. While the current trend for a stronger focus by the PBC configurations on security sector reform (SSR) activities is, in our view, positive development, it is critical to ensure that such focus does not duplicate the work carried out by United Nations missions whose mandates already include SSR assistance as priority tasks.

The same applies, to a large extent, to initiatives aimed at promoting the effective participation of women in political transition and economic recovery. We value the initiatives of the PBC to tackle what we believe is a fundamental aspect of peace consolidation in the various countries on its agenda, and can only encourage the different configurations to work with the missions on the ground, as well as with relevant United Nations organs and international partners, to ensure better coordination of existing activities.

Still on the issue of priority areas, we believe that recent debates on cross-national issues, such as the ones on transnational organized crime in West Africa, are very promising and represent an attempt to provide a regional dimension to the work of the PBC. In that respect, we encourage the configurations to work closely with United Nations regional offices in the implementation of concrete projects for combating organized crime.

The answer to the issues I have identified here require a broader refection on the relation between the PBC and other organs of the United Nations, in particular the Security Council. The PBC's annual report acknowledges some progress in the interaction between the two organs and provides recommendations on how that relationship can be strengthened.

We should work collectively to improve our working methods in order to allow us, on a regular basis, to draw upon the advice of the Chairs of country-specific configurations. The interactive dialogue to be held tomorrow represents a positive step in that direction, but there is certainly room for the Council to seek, and make a better use of, the PBC's advice, especially when discussing the renewal of mandates, but also as an early warning for potential setbacks in peace consolidation in specific countries.

In conclusion, as always, Portugal stands ready to engage in an open and creative discussion on ways to advance the PBC's contributions to more efficient and integrated action on the part of the international community throughout the various stages of post-conflict and peace consolidation in the countries involved. The success of the PBC in fulfilling its functions represents our collective success towards achieving sustainable peace.

Mr. Mashabane (South Africa): We wish to welcome you, Madam President, and we want to thank you for presiding over this meeting. We thank the Secretary-General for his briefing. In general, Madam President, we wish to thank your delegation for organizing this debate. We also thank the outgoing Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana of Rwanda, for the outstanding work done during his term. We would like to congratulate Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen of Bangladesh on his assumption of the important role of Chair of the Commission. We wish him all the best and pledge our support to his leadership.

In the intervening period between the 2005 World Summit, which took the decision to establish the peacebuilding architecture, and today's debate, we have had discussions about the relevance or the value that the PBC brings to the international peace and security equation. Among others, the principal questions that have been asked include, first, what is the added value of the PBC? Secondly, what is the relevance of the PBC? Thirdly, what is the role of the PBC? Those are critical questions that the United Nations system ponders every day, sometimes with limited answers.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission was a major milestone in recognizing the nexus and interrelatedness between security and development. Ideally, the Commission should be a premier United Nations body for dealing with the challenges of security and development. It could serve well as a point of convergence between the different organs of the United Nations with Charter mandates.

Nonetheless, South Africa would like to say from the outset that we believe that the PBC remains a relevant and critical tool in the broad realm of conflict prevention and peace consolidation. It cannot be an over-exaggeration to purport that without the efforts of the PBC in the countries on its agenda, the situation would have been different to what it is currently, that is, that we could have seen those countries relapse into conflict.

In that context, our objective analysis of the PBC further leads us to conclude that the Commission is still

evolving and that it has not yet reached its full potential. All six countries on its agenda recently witnessed a reversal in their democratic processes, in particular in Guinea-Bissau. A reflection on the achievement and challenges of the PBC is therefore crucial as we continue sharpening the tools of this important body. It is our well-considered view that we should not shy away from continuous reflection on the need to strengthen the Commission's capacity with the necessary tools, skills and expertise. That may well mean differentiating between the notion of peacebuilding and the nature and configuration of the actual structure that is the Commission.

Today's discussion should also be seen as an important opportunity to recommit ourselves to the pledge that we took when we unanimously adopted the resolutions that created the peacebuilding architecture, in 2005. One critical moment in which the international community intervened in the life of the Commission was the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, which provided concrete recommendations on how to enhance the work of the Commission. My delegation is pleased to learn, as stated in the report (S/2012/70) under discussion, that there is a growing momentum to implement relevant recommendations developed during that review.

South Africa is encouraged at the progress made by the Peacebuilding Commission and the country-specific configurations in the countries on its agenda. While we welcome those positive developments, we also believe that more can and should be done. In that regard, I would like to focus on the issue of enhancing the utility of the country-specific configurations.

We believe that the membership of the country-specific configurations should be encouraged to take on specific responsibilities, ranging from political to financial support. One of the main tasks of the PBC is to provide political attention to, and advocacy for, the countries on its agenda. In that context, the members of the configurations should be encouraged to bring their influence to bear and to provide the necessary political backbone to the countries on whose configurations they sit.

Furthermore, membership in those configurations should not be simply a label of prestige for its members, but should come with responsibility. Therefore, as recommended in the 2010 review, in order to improve the PBC's effectiveness on the ground, the Chairs of configurations should not be personalized, so as to allow the country from which the configuration Chair comes or that the Chair represents at the United Nations to take the lead in the process, or at least to be actively engaged. That could be even easier and more effective where the country that the Chair represents at the United Nations has diplomatic representation in the country on the PBC agenda. It is a fact that we have not yet reflected on whether the composition, which is currently made up of State representatives based here in New York, is the only way to make up the Commission, or whether we should be flexible and open-minded about expertise residing elsewhere, whether in the civil service or in the private sector.

With respect to coordination and strategic partnerships, we believe that increased coordination is crucial for ensuring effective international efforts in post-conflict situations and international interventions. United Nations efforts are often fragmented and face a struggle to pull the critical resources together and maximize the strength of collective efforts. Over the years, the PBC, as part of that United Nations machinery, has also had to struggle to coordinate resources that are necessary to strengthen and sustain new peace. In that regard, South Africa strongly supports the call for greater coherence, coordination and interaction between various United Nations organs and agencies, especially in the field. Greater coordination has the potential to avert duplication of efforts and maximize output at a time of limited and constantly shrinking resources.

The interaction with the World Bank and donor organizations is welcome and should be sustained. We also welcome the dynamic partnership between the Commission and the African Development Bank. However, we would encourage cooperation with the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa as well. We further welcome the engagement with the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of African States.

Having recognized the inextricable link between security and development, we welcome the growing relationship between the Commission and the Economic and Social Council. As regards coordination in the field, the PBC should be given the mandate to be the sole convener or coordinator of at least the United Nations peacebuilding interventions in countries on its agenda. In consultation with other stakeholders, the United Nations should ensure that all other agencies,

including civil society, should channel their efforts through the PBC at the country level in the interest of avoiding possible duplication and competition for space and attention. The integrated peacebuilding Mission in Sierra Leone, where the PBC involvement was aligned with the priorities of the Government through its national Agenda for Change, could be used as an example.

We believe that the relationship between the Security Council and the PBC is perhaps the most important one, given the mandates of both entities. The PBC report notes that, "The relationship with the Security Council has continued to develop during the reporting period." (*S/2012/70, para. 24*) That positive development is evidenced, inter alia, by the introduction of informal interactions between the Council and the Chairs of the country configurations.

We would once again like to stress the need for the Council to consider flexible working methods so as to enable the PBC to play its role effectively in advising the Council on post-conflict situations. Whereas the Council has incorporated peacebuilding tasks in virtually all, if not all its peacekeeping mandates, we nevertheless emphasize that the advice of the PBC should be sought at all times where it is deemed relevant. We also reiterate that peacekeeping and peacebuilding should be mutually reinforcing in the pursuance of lasting peace in post-conflict countries.

With respect to resource mobilization, it goes without saying that peacebuilding in post-conflict countries requires a substantive injection of resources. In that regard, we believe that timely, sustainable and predictable financing remains a crucial ingredient in realizing the objectives of peacebuilding. We therefore emphasize the need for the United Nations to consider utilizing sustainable mechanisms as a means of kick-starting peacebuilding activities in countries emerging from conflict, including assessed contributions, especially with regard to quick-impact projects. Such projects are critical for the consolidation of peace dividends so as to avert a total relapse into conflict.

Post-conflict countries often have weak human and institutional capacities for peacebuilding. South Africa emphasizes the importance of building local institutional and human capacities and of providing training to create new, and enhance already existing, capacities. We welcome the process led by the United Nations Development Programme to strengthen the United Nations system-wide approach to capacity development for peacebuilding. In developing such capacities, we cannot over-emphasize the importance of forging partnerships at the local, regional and subregional levels in order to exploit the unique advantages inherent in human capacities at those levels. In that context, the notion of developing and tapping into civilian capacities, particularly from the global South, is crucial. In developing those capacities, national ownership should be emphasized at all the stages of the peacebuilding process.

To conclude, South Africa reiterates its commitment to the work of the PBC. We believe that the Commission has a critical role to play in terms of conflict prevention, including in the early detection of root and proximate causes, as well as in identifying potential triggers of conflict. Africa has benefited from the efforts of the PBC. We want to see a more robust, agile and resourced body that will help the continent avert conflict and consolidate fragile peace where it is created.

Mr. Loulichki (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Columbia for her excellent contribution to today's discussion, which is a very important one for my country and the other members of the Council. I would also like to express my gratitude for the fifth annual report on the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2012/70), as well as to commend the Secretary-General on his personal involvement in strengthening the United Nations role in peacekeeping. I also wish to thank as Ambassadors Eugène-Richard Gasana and Abulkalam Abdul Momem, along with World Bank Vice-President Joachim von Amsberg, for their edifying presentations.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement that will delivered later in the meeting by the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Post-conflict management is so important that its outcome, whether for good or ill, can either save a country or condemn it to instability, as examples drawn from recent experience amply prove. In particular, they show us that the bases of peacebuilding begin to take shape as soon as peace is established and that they play a determining role in the country's process of transition and transformation. Before they become the responsibility of the international community, those transitions and changes are first and foremost the responsibility of the authorities of the affected

countries. Ownership on the part of the stakeholders concerned in post-conflict countries is a sine qua non condition for any successful peacebuilding initiative. Such national ownership requires prioritizing actions to ensure that the stabilization process goes forward, without backsliding. In our view, those priorities are security, the rule of law, national reconciliation and socio-economic development.

Clearly, no country emerging from conflict can build peace without timely, substantive and sustained help from the international community, including its neighbouring States and the regional and subregional organizations it belongs to. The United Nations system is called on to play a central and catalytic role in peacebuilding, given the confidence it inspires, the credibility it brings and the collective knowledge it has gathered over decades. Within the United Nations architecture, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has demonstrated its usefulness, its relevance and its ability to turn the tide in the initial stages of peacebuilding.

The establishment of the Commission, six years ago, decisively marked the beginning of a new United Nations approach to international peace and security and development. By virtue of its multifaceted nature, that new organ filled an institutional vacuum, addressing issues of security, development and aid in an integrated way. Because of the wide representation of its membership, the Commission is a credible entity for coordination and the sharing of best practices in helping countries emerging from conflict.

I would like to focus today on two crucial issues that seem to me to demand special attention, namely, funding and coordination. The PBC cannot fully reach its potential and make a difference on the ground if it lacks the funding necessary for its work, as all speakers today have stressed. The funding it can count on has to date fallen short of the urgent needs of the countries on its agenda. That affects not only its effectiveness but also its visibility as a peacebuilding actor, as members of the Council saw in West Africa last May. We agree with the Working Group on Lessons Learned that the Commission would benefit from exploring new, innovative and dependable means of funding its projects while strengthening its relationships with other elements of the United Nations system, international financial institutions and regional development banks, such as the African Development Bank and the Islamic Development Bank.

The important work done by the Working Group on Lessons Learned in mapping possible areas of cooperation among the various country configurations should be encouraged. It must be said that the Commission's growing appeal for countries emerging from conflict is often not accompanied by awareness of or gratitude for its work. Communication lines must therefore absolutely be established to give greater visibility to the PBC, to its role in countries benefiting from its assistance and to the contributions it can make elsewhere, as underlined by the Secretary-General in his opening statement.

The Organization enjoys significant human, technical and financial resources that would benefit from being focused along the lines of the PBC. It is therefore crucial to increase coherence. The contribution of regional actors and subregional organizations is of great importance to achieving peace, stability and development for countries emerging from conflict. We believe that triangular cooperation is an approach that the Commission should further explore, especially when it comes to South-South cooperation. That would make it possible to adapt methods to local circumstances and to optimize the use of available resources.

With the establishment of the Guinea configuration, in 2011, the number of PBC country configurations rose to six. We would like to take this opportunity to commend the current Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and his predecessor for the practical and important work they have done.

Given the geographic proximity of many countries emerging from conflict and the similar socio-economic and security challenges they face, we believe that the time to establish regional configurations has come. Such areas of focus, for example along the Mano River, which runs through Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone, or in the Sahel or the Great Lakes region, would make for better coordination of action and increased coherence in peacebuilding operations at the subregional level. In the light of recent developments in the Sahel, we believe the PBC should come to the aid of the countries of the Sahel-Sahara Strip that are either in conflict or emerging from institutional crises.

Strengthening the role of the Peacebuilding Commission within the United Nations architecture is of particular importance to sustain the successes achieved in many countries on the African continent. The relationship between the Commission and the

Security Council should be further strengthened. In that context, we commend the regular invitations extended by the Council to the Chairs of the configurations to share their perspectives and assessments of the countries on the Commission's agenda. At the same time, we appreciate and support strengthened cooperation between the Commission and the Economic and Social Council and between the Commission and international and continental financial institutions.

Mr. Rosenthal (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, Madam President, allow me to say that we are pleased to see you presiding over this meeting. We appreciate your personal presence, we appreciate the delegation of Colombia's having organized this open debate and we appreciate the excellent concept paper you have prepared to guide our deliberations (S/2012/511, annex). We also wish to express our thanks to the Secretary-General for his statement and to the secretariat for the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2012/70), which covers the proceedings of its fifth session.

Guatemala was a Member State of the Commission during the period under consideration and even had the honour of holding one of the Vice-Chairs. We therefore can relate to the contents of the report, in both its informational and analytical aspects. We especially appreciate the detailed information on each of the countries belonging to specific configurations when it comes to the main functions of the Commission, namely, political advocacy and support, resource mobilization and fostering coherence.

We are grateful for the statements made by Ambassadors Gasana and Momen and by Mr. Von Amsberg of the World Bank, whom we welcome here today.

What gave life to the Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 was a very simple idea, conceptually speaking. The United Nations had accumulated 60 years of solid experience in both peacekeeping and development. The time had come to capitalize on those experiences, crystallizing them in a specialized entity that would apply the lessons learned in both areas to countries emerging from conflict — in other words, in peacebuilding processes.

A corollary to that idea is reflected in the institutional aspect, since three of the principal inter-governmental organs — the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council — addressed different aspects of peacemaking or peacebuilding. What could be better than creating a specialized body linked to those three organs that would foster greater coherence within the United Nations system in addressing specifically the situation of countries emerging from conflict?

As will be recalled, the Commission was created through concurrent resolutions 60/180 of the General Assembly and 1645 (2005) of the Security Council, after a relatively prolonged negotiation period. Furthermore, the possibility of modifying the forum was agreed to, by establishing a five-year review process.

Consequently, in 2010 three of our colleagues — from South Africa, Mexico and Ireland — provided the Council with their report (S/2010/393, annex), which tries to reflect the opposing views within the United Nations regarding the performance of the Commission. The main conclusion of the three co-facilitators can be characterized in a single phrase: the hopes that accompanied the creation of the Commission "have yet to be realized". The report contains recommendations that seek to close the gap between expectations and results. The General Assembly and the Security Council so aligned themselves in adopting General Assembly resolution 65/7 and Security Council resolution 1947 (2010).

In a brief statement it is neither possible nor appropriate to address the multiple issues raised both in the co-facilitators' report and in the Commission's report before us. For that reason we are grateful to the Colombian presidency for its concept paper, which ends with three questions that will help us to focus our remaining remarks. I shall be brief.

First, how can the Commission realize its potential to provide added value to the web of institutions dedicated to similar roles? In our judgment, if the Commission would fully comply with its mandate its added value would be self-evident, since, contrary to the question's implication, its role is unique. It does not need to compete with other forums to gain attention or space. The way to highlight its role is to improve its capacity to create partnerships within and outside of the United Nations. Within the Organization, owing to the constitution of its membership, it can be said that the Commission is a product of the three principal intergovernmental organs I have mentioned, and as such forms a hinge between them, thereby strengthening the role of each.

Furthermore, the Commission represents a meeting point among the Security Council — whose mandate is limited to maintaining international peace and security — the General Assembly and, above all, the Economic and Social Council, which have mandates in the area of development and democratic governance. Of course, the dividing line between peace-making and peacebuilding is hazy, but precisely for that reason a good understanding between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission would enhance compliance with each organ's mandates, especially in the field.

However, our perception is that in practice each forum carries out its activities separately. In other words, the frequent invocations of coordinated efforts are more rhetorical than operational. That must end and give way to genuine alliances. The same can be said regarding alliances outside of the United Nations, especially among the international financial institutions. Some progress has been achieved in that connection, especially regarding the World Bank and the African Development Bank. But we believe that there is still a long way to go.

Secondly, what tools should the Commission utilize to expand its potential in each of its three main functions to have a greater impact in the field? In our brief experience in the Commission, we perceived the greatest potential at the level of the country configurations, which have clearly had a positive impact on the ground, but could be strengthened even more. The leadership of the configurations plays a critical role, and so the selection of their Chairs merits special care. Theu do not necessarily have to be limited to the pool of United Nations accredited Permanent Representatives; one could also consider notable persons from outside of the Organization.

The other instrument that clearly has had an important impact, with intrinsic value as well as a catalytic element for the other root functions of the Commission, is the Peacebuilding Fund. A call should be made to the entire donor community to replenish the Fund with fresh resources, since, in our opinion, and as the Secretary-General indicated this morning, it has been the most successful element of the United Nations efforts in the area of peacebuilding.

Thirdly, what can Member States contribute, individually and collectively, to empower the Commission and bring it closer to meeting its core objectives? The Commission, like any intergovernmental organ, is the product of the responsible guidance and support of the Member States and the enlightened support of its secretariat. Up to now, the demands to expand the number of country configurations has collided with the finite capacity of the secretariat to handle a larger volume of activity. In other words, we must support the Secretariat and continue to support our active participation in this forum with the dedication, care and, I would even say, sacrifice that many countries have demonstrated over the past five years.

The Peacebuilding Commission has become one of those cases that we frequently encounter that is characterized by the "glass half full" syndrome. We believe that there is the potential to fill the other half of the proverbial glass and transform the Commission into what it was expected to be when our Heads of State and Government adopted the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). Both the report of the co-facilitators of 2010 and the most recent report of the Commission suggest ways to achieve this goal.

Mr. Vinay Kumar (India): Let me begin by welcoming you, Madam President, to the Security Council and by thanking the Colombian delegation for organizing today's open debate. Our thanks also go to the Secretary-General, Ambassadors Gasana and Momen, and the Vice-President of the World Bank for their valuable statements. I also want to put on rèco· 1our appreciation for the useful concept paper (S/2012/511, annex) provided by your delegation, Madam, to anchor our deliberations today.

The nature of conflicts today is very different from what it was in the past. Their intra-State nature, the need to manage natural resources, transnational organized crime, illicit trafficking in drugs and weapons, and regional dimensions demand an approach that is capable of building upon the gains of stabilization. Building the institutions of core governance, promoting youth employment, ensuring transitional justice and national reconciliation, providing electoral support and constitution-building are tasks that need the coherent and sustained assistance of the international community. This in turn requires political will, the allocation of adequate resources and readiness for long-term engagement.

It is in this context that peacebuilding, once described as the missing middle between peacekeeping and durable peace, assumes importance. The setting

up of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) six years ago reflected the collective desire of the international community to assist post-conflict countries on a long-term basis in their transition. Despite its advisory role, the Commission and its Organizing Committee have done work worthy of our commendation in mainstreaming peacebuilding.

Given the wide range of tasks the PBC is expected to administer, it is not surprising that it faces several challenges. In our view, the willingness of the international community to provide adequate resources is the first and necessary condition for successful peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict countries.

Secondly, greater coherence among various United Nations organs under the aegis of the Commission is required to enhance its ability to carry its agenda forward. In this connection, I would like to mention that the organizational context of peacebuilding continues to lack uniformity. Some peacebuilding efforts are being managed by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, others by the Department of Political Affairs, and yet others by the United Nations Resident Coordinator system. Clearly, peacebuilding policymaking needs to be suitably addressed in this Organization today.

It is also important to keep in mind that peace in post-conflict societies cannot be restored unless citizens are free from fear and want and institutions of governance perform effectively. The capacity for effective governance, in turn, depends on the existence of institutions that enable these authorities to respond effectively to people's aspirations. This general political aphorism is substantiated by the experience of the international community in its peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts over the past two decades.

We therefore think that the core institutions of governance are the key to sustainable peace. They must be rooted locally rather than being imposed from above. Their local relevance and inclusiveness will make all the difference in the governance process. It is therefore important for the PBC to align its objectives with national priorities and ensure that all plans and programmes are implemented under national leadership and through national institutions so that gains are sustainable, if slow. The Commission must also draw from the experiences that are the most relevant to the prevailing socio-economic conditions in the countries on its agenda. An effective measure of the success of peacebuilding efforts will be the Commission's success in promoting inclusive political processes, national reconciliation and security sector reforms.

Peacebuilding anchored firmly in the overall peace process will deliver the best results. This requires the international community to make available a predictable and appropriate level of resources over extended periods. Our advocacy must be accompanied by matching commitments in resources.

The United Nations capacity to assist national institutions is contingent upon the Secretariat and the funds and programmes having the skills and expertise that are relevant to these societies. We believe that the Secretary-General's review of civilian capacity is a step towards making that process inclusive and representative. We firmly believe that the nimbleness of recruitment and deployment is not a sufficient condition for performance delivery.

Those willing to invest their lives in the field must be valued. Our in-house experts who have gained valuable insights by spending time in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Darfur, the Sudan and other challenging locations should be the pivots of all our endeavours. Our efforts, at the same time, must be demand-driven and nimble in order to respond the changing times, rather than supply-driven. Our ways of selecting police and military officers on secondment need to be simplified. Communication methods with Member States have stagnated and are outdated in this regard. The representative nature of our institutions will ensure the collective spirit of our enterprise, including in the Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that, as a responsible global citizen with extensive nation-building experience that is very relevant for countries on the PBC agenda, India will not be found wanting in responding to the challenges of the peacebuilding process, including under the aegis of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Araud (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank you, Madam President, for your presence among us here today, and Colombia for having organized this open debate on peacebuilding. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General; the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh; his predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda; and the representative of the World Bank.

France associates itself with the statement to be made on behalf of the European Union.

We note today that, despite the 2010 review, the role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is still being defined. I would therefore like to make three comments concerning this matter.

First, the primary role of the PBC is to identify, together with the States concerned, the needs on the ground and the stakeholders who are already involved. Contact with those in the field offers a picture of the needs on the ground. The work carried out in the case of Guinea is an example of this. The mapping exercise carried out by Luxembourg and Japan provides us with a precise, quantifiable picture of the existing shortcomings and projects needed to remedy them. This exercise deserves to be repeated in other country-specific configurations of the PBC.

The identification of the most pressing areas should be the result of an in-depth dialogue with the relevant State. To facilitate this dialogue, there are integrated peacebuilding offices in a number of post-conflict countries, such as Burundi and the Central African Republic. The country-specific configuration of the Commission must be in close contact with these offices, and their exchanges must be fluid. That dialogue will be effective only if links with the field are strengthened. As was demonstrated by the Security Council's visit to western Africa, the PBC is sometimes lacking in visibility in States in the region, in particular Sierra Leone.

Once the work to identify needs has been completed, it is important for the PBC to be able to play its political supporting role. On the one hand, an important element of the tasks entrusted to the Peacebuilding Commission is that of advocacy, especially for resource mobilization. On the other hand, the PBC should open a dialogue with the authorities of countries on its agenda in order to ask them to take specific commitments and follow up with results on the ground.

The signing of mutual commitments or peacebuilding plans with a State is not in itself enough to guarantee that they will in fact be implemented. For example, the peacebuilding plan for South Sudan is blocked for now as a result of budgetary austerity. In a number of situations, States do not possess the means to cover and fully participate in all projects under way. It is therefore essential to establish priorities and to be realistic.

Finally, the key element of the role of the Peacebuilding Commission is coordination. The PBC was designed as a platform for contact between the various members of the international community, including the international financial institutions, which play a decisive role in this regard. Partnerships with them must be developed. Coordination is a long-term endeavour. To ensure the sustainability of the international community's commitment, various efforts aimed at reviewing the topic have been launched, such as, inter alia, the review of civilian capacities. The issue of partnership development lies at the very heart of that review. We believe that that approach provides us with the best hope for a long-term commitment.

The international community must not create conditions of dependence where a State is kept on life support, but rather conditions for recovery. An excellent option is the drawing up of contracts such as the New Deal for International Engagement in Fragile States developed at the 2011 Forum on Aid Effectiveness, in Busan, which involved defining a State's commitment and so involves it in the project. Initiatives aimed at promoting the recovery of a viable economic fabric must be especially encouraged. The joint informal event of the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission in June on partnerships for youth job creation in States emerging from conflict was useful. That approach should also be reflected on the ground in each State on the PBC's agenda.

I will conclude by underscoring that to bring a coordinated response to post-conflict situations and to make sustainable any return to peace and stability, the Commission must work as a flexible and responsive mechanism, one bringing all players together in a joint action plan. It therefore behoves us to be especially vigilant with regard to the risks of bureaucratization of this young institution.

Mr. Wittig (Germany) Madam President, let me begin by thanking you, Ambassador Néstor Osorio and your whole delegation for today's important and timely initiative and for preparing an excellent concept note for our debate (S/2012/511, annex). Let me also thank the Secretary-General for his briefing, as well as the current and former Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and Vice-President Von Amsberg of the World Bank for their insightful statements. Let me also commend Assistant Secretary-General Judy Cheng-Hopkins for her important work at the helm of the Peacebuilding Support Office.

Germany aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the observer of the European Union later on in today's debate.

We are here today not only to discuss the latest annual report of the PBC (S/2012/70), but also to speak in more general terms about how we can enhance the role of the Commission within the United Nations system, and in particular the impact that it has in the field. In our view, the PBC has not yet entirely realized its full potential. What can be done better? The concept paper prepared by the Colombian presidency raises important questions. The PBC's engagement with a country needs to be flexible and has to evolve on the basis of a continuous assessment. Our approaches must be context-specific; there is no single approach that will fit all situations. However, there are a few overarching points and principles that seem important to us.

First, we need to clarify what the role of the PBC is and set realistic expectations. It seems that the PBC's success has often been measured only by its capacity to mobilize resources. Resource mobilization, including by mobilizing non-traditional donors, is indeed a key role of the PBC. But it needs to be clear that that is not its only role. Supporting countries politically as they emerge from conflict and fostering coherence among international actors are other core tasks outlined in the PBC's founding resolutions. Eligibility for funding by the Peacebuilding Fund is therefore also linked to a country's national commitment to a political peacebuilding process. To marshal resources is not an isolated task but has to go hand in hand with a credible and nationally owned political process. The PBC can only be successful if there is a genuine political commitment by the national Government in question to a political peacebuilding process.

Secondly, effective political support of countries on the PBC's agenda can only work if there is close cooperation between the PBC and other key actors on the ground, namely, the executive representatives and Special Representatives of the Secretary-General. The roles and responsibilities of the different actors must be clearly outlined in order to avoid overlap. The first meeting between the PBC country configuration Chairs and the Secretary-General's representatives for countries on the PBC's agenda, which took place in New York in May, was an important step in the right direction. In our view, such a dialogue needs to take place on a much more regular basis. The comparative advantage of the PBC compared with United Nations missions on the ground is its intergovernmental structure, which should allow it to lend the the Secretary-General's representatives additional political weight.

Thirdly, the PBC must make better use of the political leverage of its individual members. PBC member States need to become better at assisting the PBC country configuration Chairs in their work. Members of the PBC's Organizational Committee and the PBC country configurations have a responsibility to support the PBC so that it can have a true impact on the ground. The PBC was created as a body composed of members of different United Nations bodies, including seven members of the Security Council, precisely for the reason that those members bring their political weight and experience from other bodies to the PBC's activities. The intergovernmental nature of the PBC needs to be much better used in order to support the countries on its agenda.

Fourthly, the PBC needs to maintain stronger and more regular rapport with other key partners in the field, especially with major donors such as the World Bank, active bilateral donors and other relevant international actors. I therefore welcome the presence of Vice-President Von Amsberg of the World Bank at today's meeting. His statement on the improved coordination between the World Bank and the PBC in post-conflict situations is reassuring. We encourage both sides to make full use of their potential for future cooperation. It is only through a regular, strong rapport that gaps and overlaps will be identified, be they in resourcing or in civilian capacity-building.

Fifthly, we believe that there need to be more interactive and dynamic relations between the PBC and the Council. We welcome the fact that the Chairs of the PBC country configurations are regularly included in briefings to the Security Council. Council members should, in our view, also consider inviting the PBC country configuration Chairs, as appropriate, to closed consultations of the Security Council. Furthermore, we should work on expanding existing informal ways of interaction between the PBC and the Security Council outside the Consultations Room. In that connection, we have had fruitful informal exchanges of views on both Burundi and Liberia. We think it could be beneficial to the work of the Council to have more of those informal exchanges of views.

The PBC's Organizational Committee can do better in using the advantages of its unique intergovernmental

structure. It could potentially serve as an ideal platform to create stronger links between developments that take place outside the United Nations, such as activities of the World Bank, but also such initiatives as the New Deal for International Engagement in Fragile and the peacebuilding agenda of the United Nations. Equally, the PBC could help to link certain processes within the United Nations, such as the post-2015 development agenda, to the peacebuilding agenda.

Having myself served as Chair of the PBC's Organizational Committee, in 2010, I am very well aware of the opportunities, the challenges and the limitations of that unique intergovernmental body. All of us created it together in order to achieve more durable peace and development in countries emerging from conflict. It is therefore also our common responsibility to make it work.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are pleased to see you, Madam President, presiding over this meeting. Your presence with us today is an illustration both of the importance of the peacebuilding theme and of that which Colombia and all of us attach to building solid and lasting foundations for peace and security through socio-economic development.

(*spoke in English*)

I thank the Secretary-General for his briefing and for the work he has done in fostering peacebuilding as an essential component of the United Nations work. I also thank Ambassadors Gasana and Momem for their statements on the past and current work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I also welcome the presence with us today of the Vice-President from the World Bank.

Allow me to touch upon three issues that should continue to merit our attention in the near future, namely, the relationship between the PBC and other United Nations bodies; the partnership with external actors; and resource mobilization.

As many previous speakers have said, enhancing the PBC's institutional linkages with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council has been one of the most important undertakings of the Commission. That is a natural consequence of the diversity of challenges that it has to address and of the need to muster political support from the wider membership. We are convinced, in particular, that the PBC is in a unique position to perform its advisory role to the Security Council, especially with regard to countries that are on the agenda of both bodies. As the Council has already recognized, security and development are closely interlinked. The PBC is naturally suited to offer a comprehensive perspective on the root causes of conflict and on the multiple challenges in post-conflict scenarios. An integrated approach that takes into account the close interrelation between security and development as pillars of sustainable peace should be seen as an important added value of the PBC.

A coherent mix of peacebuilding and peacekeeping activities is also a powerful tool to ensure that short-term stabilization will be matched by a greater capacity to deal with medium- and long-term challenges to security. The better a State is equipped to address social and economic strife, the more it will be able to avoid a relapse into conflict. In that regard, the perspectives of the PBC can be valuable in a variety of areas, such as in security sector reform; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes; the economic inclusion of women; youth employment; the management of natural resources; and the restoration of basic services and economic revitalization. We therefore hope that the synergy between the Security Council and the PBC will be continually strengthened, including through more frequent interactive dialogues and the participation of PBC Chairs in discussions that are of interest to both bodies.

Furthering a stronger relationship with regional organizations and United Nations missions is of the utmost importance to ensuring a more in-depth perspective on the reality on the ground and closer involvement with local stakeholders. The annual report (S/2012/70) demonstrates that the pool of PBC partners has been expanded lately. It is up to us to maintain the momentum. The case of international financial institutions should be singled out. The World Bank, the African Development Bank and the International Monetary Fund have been pivotal in helping post-conflict countries to improve economic management, jump-start economic recovery and access much-needed financial support.

That brings me to my last point, namely, the mobilization of resources. As we are all aware, the countries on the PBC's agenda usually have to overcome situations that generate a perception of high risk on the

part of donors, investors and international institutions. It is our role is to help them find ways of increasing the level of attention from the international community and garner the necessary resources to develop national capacities and to maintain stability.

We hope that today's discussions will be a further step in enhancing the relationship between the PBC and the Security Council. We also expect that it will help the Commission to play an even more meaningful role in the United Nations system.

As Chair of the Guinea-Bissau country-specific configuration, as well as a member of the Organizational Committee, Brazil reiterates its commitment to our common efforts to assisting countries emerging from conflict to achieve peace, stability and socioeconomic development.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There are still a number of speakers remaining on my list. Given the lateness of the hour, I intend, with the consent of the Council, to suspend the meeting until 3 o'clock.

The meeting was suspended at 1.05 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.6805 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Sixty-seventh year

Provisional

6805th meeting
Thursday, 12 July 2012, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Holguín Cuéllar/Mr. Alzate/Ms. Rengifo Vargas	(Colombia)
Members:	Azerbaijan	Mr. Huseynli
	China	Mr. Zhang Changwei
	France	Mr. Bertoux
	Germany	Mrs. Osten-Vaa
	Guatemala	Ms. Bolaños Pérez
	India	Mr. Raguttahalli
	Morocco	Mr. Benmoussa
	Pakistan	Mr. Ahmad
	Portugal	Mr. Courela
	Russian Federation	Ms. Evstigneeva
	South Africa	Mr. Ratlou
	Togo	Mr. M'Beou
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms. Davison
	United States of America	Ms. Finerty

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70)

Note verbale dated 2 July 2012 from the Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2012/511)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

12-41726 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was resumed at 3.05 p.m.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than four minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate the text in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

I now give the floor to the representative of Luxembourg.

Ms. Lucas (Luxembourg) (*spoke in French*): Luxembourg fully aligns itself with the statement to be made later by the observer of the European Union.

I would like to thank you, Sir, for having organized this open debate on peacebuilding, which enables the Council to focus on issues of peacebuilding and post-conflict stabilization and the work accomplished by the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in this context. It also allows all interested parties to deepen their understanding and their ownership of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission. I would like to welcome in this regard the participation of Mr. Von Amsberg. The full engagement of the World Bank and other regional and international financial institutions is essential to a coordinated and coherent approach to peacebuilding and development efforts.

While it is true that peacebuilding in general does not lead to immediately quantifiable outcomes, the efforts towards it are nonetheless essential to creating sustainable peace and security over the longer term and to paving the way to development. Given my experience as Chair of the Guinea country-specific configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission and given the Commission's mandate, allow me to offer some comments regarding the questions raised in the excellent concept note prepared by the Colombian presidency for this debate (S/2012/511).

One strength of the Peacebuilding Commission is its intergovernmental nature and its mobilizing potential. The Guinea configuration alone brings together 46 Member States, as well as important regional and international actors, such as the African Union, the European Union and the International Organization of the Francophonie. The Commission thus offers a valuable framework to orchestrate the efforts of various stakeholders at work in the country concerned and to avoid possible gaps that could result from an absence of dialogue or insufficient information flow among parties from different backgrounds.

The Peacebuilding Commission is not and should not be an operational body. It is a political platform designed to enable the country in question to attract the necessary international support to achieve its peacebuilding and State-building priorities. The Commission must be a space where the deep-seated obstacles to peacebuilding – be they political deadlocks, structural or socio-economic difficulties, or regional challenges – can be addressed and counted.

In the case of Guinea, the Peacebuilding Commission is the only international actor with a political mandate to address these issues. We have, together with the authorities of Guinea, identified priorities for action in the areas of national reconciliation, reform of the security and defence sectors, and youth and women's employment. These priorities are set down in a statement of mutual commitments.

It is true that the PBC must improve its way of doing business. By this, I refer in particular to greater ownership of the Peacebuilding Commission by its member States, as well as to a better understanding and ownership of the role of the Commission by United Nations system actors, in order to avoid any form of competition between the representatives of the United Nations system on the ground and the country-specific configurations. I remain convinced nevertheless that the PBC has an essential role to play in raising the awareness of relevant stakeholders to the needs of countries emerging from conflict or crisis and in mobilizing the energies necessary for their recovery.

Like the President of the Organizational Committee of the PBC, Ambassador Momen, I am also convinced that the Peacebuilding Commission can give added value to the Council's work when the latter is considering the situation of countries on the agenda of a specific configuration not only by shining a light on ongoing peacebuilding activities, but also, in more general terms, by helping to achieve the transition between peacekeeping and peacebuilding in the best possible way. The Peacebuilding Commission can also usefully contribute to the Council's consideration of regional challenges, such as transnational organized crime or drug or human trafficking.

We have stressed time and again that our cooperation with the countries on the agenda of the PBC is based on the principles of national ownership, partnership and

mutual accountability. These principles breathe life into the triple role of the country-specific configurations: political support and advocacy, support to coherence and coordination, and resource mobilization. These principles must also inspire our interaction in the interest of the populations of the countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission and in general of countries emerging from conflict.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. Rishchynski (Canada): At the outset, let me commend the Colombian presidency for its initiative in convening this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding.

International assistance still suffers from inadequate coordination, insufficient attention and persistent capacity gaps. In short, the challenges that motivated the creation of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture remain very relevant today.

Canada's experience as Chair of the Sierra Leone configuration is instructive in this regard. In Sierra Leone, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is fortunate to work with highly effective partners. The Government has articulated a clear national vision for development that includes reference to peacebuilding challenges in the areas of good governance, youth unemployment and combating drug trafficking, which the PBC has adopted as its own priorities. Sierra Leone's international partners are also providing committed and coordinated assistance. Most importantly, the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone and the United Nations country team have developed an innovative joint approach that uses peacebuilding as an overarching frame – a leitmotif – for their wider efforts.

In the context of such well-functioning arrangements, including strong political leadership from the United Nations in the field, the Commission has served as a source of support when needed. It has aligned directly with national priorities, endorsed the innovative approach adopted in Freetown, and provided strong support for the United Nations political engagement.

(*spoke in French*)

While this record shows promise and the PBC is a rapidly evolving institution, faster progress is needed. The PBC faces several interrelated challenges. First, it was assigned an ambitious mandate, but limited authority. If the Commission is to succeed, a wider group of Member States should use it as a tool for enhancing international support. Secondly, peacebuilding involves engagement with a wide range of actors. The PBC needs to be better integrated with these existing processes, especially with respect to the work of the United Nations system at Headquarters and in the field. In this respect, the Commission should also continue to deepen growing partnerships with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the African Development Bank. Based on this assessment, Canada would like to offer some suggestions.

(*spoke in English*)

First, the Peacebuilding Commission should continue to integrate itself into emerging peacebuilding policy and practice. Its contribution, strategic approach and modality of engagement should be tailored to the needs of each case and sensitive to where the Commission can make a difference. In this sense, the Peacebuilding Commission should prioritize providing added value to wider peacebuilding processes ahead of its own bureaucratic needs and visibility.

Secondly, Member States bear the ultimate responsibility for the success or failure of the Commission. More committed engagement in New York, from capitals and in the field should be considered. The Commission should also work to identify opportunities for the concrete involvement of a much wider range of actors.

Canada believes that, on the whole, the Organization has made steady progress in the face of enduring challenges. It also has the potential to make a much greater contribution. The Commission and the Security Council should work to deepen their partnership. The Commission can also better tailor its advice to the Security Council's approach in a given country. And we believe that, with greater focus on delivering added value, the Commission could be better prepared to turn potential into reality.

(*spoke in French*)

We thank you once again, Sir, for this opportunity to share with the Security Council our comments and experience with the PBC.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Sweden.

Mr. Tillander (Sweden): Sweden associates itself with the statement to be delivered by the observer of the European Union.

Since April this year, Sweden has held the Chair of the Liberia configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). I will be serving in that capacity on a full-time basis. Since I assumed this position, I have visited Liberia once and will make my next trip later this month. The national commitment of Sweden will be broad, strong and long-term. We will continue our high-level political dialogue with Liberia; our bilateral cooperation programme and the work of the Embassy in Monrovia will intensify; we play a lead role in the World Trade Organization to pave the way for increased Liberian trade; and in the New Deal pilot with Liberia and the United States, we will focus efforts on realizing State-building goals.

My comments will be made with these commitments in mind. I will focus my intervention on questions raised in the concept note (S/2012/511), using Liberia as an example.

First, how can the PBC produce added value in a crowded and fragmented field of operational actors? Our common aim is to see Liberia consolidate peace. We will be better able to achieve this if the United Nations system works in a coordinated manner and if there is a smooth transition from United Nations peacekeeping to long-term development efforts.

Towards this end, the PBC's lack of operational mandate might actually be one of its key assets. The PBC can promote coherence by unblocking impasses, facilitating cooperation and coordination, and playing a catalytic role in maximizing the capacity of the entire United Nations family and its common efforts. Here is an important connection to the United Nations Delivering as One and to a coordinated approach for the international community as a whole. This is also in line with the recommendation of the 2010 PBC review that the Commission strengthen linkages between New York and the field and work closely with the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General.

Concern has been voiced about the PBC's limited visibility, but increased visibility is not the main objective and probably not a very good measure of success. It may actually make the field more crowded. A better measure of success is concrete change on the ground, which would likely be best realized through a team effort.

The second question from the concept note is: How can we use the tools of the PBC to make a tangible impact at the country level? Central to this will be the PBC's concrete support for national ownership – a theme that many have already commented on. Careful selection of the issues where the PBC can make a difference is another aspect of this.

One such issue is that of the police, which play a key role in enabling the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) to carry out a responsible withdrawal. As the Council is aware, based on its recent deliberations on Liberia, the number of police there needs to be doubled. That should be done in the context of strengthening the full range of the rule of law protections in the context of the continued security sector reform. While the international engagement should continue under UNMIL's overall responsibility for the immediate future, it is also essential to enhance collaboration with bilateral partners in order to provide qualified trainers and take the lead in specialized fields.

As a follow-up to my discussion with the President during my visit in May on the need for increased coherence in police training, I convened two steering group meetings with United Nations colleagues and representatives from both Monrovia and Headquarters. The United Nations peacekeeping Mission in Liberia prepared a discussion paper, and we reached some preliminary views that will be useful in the upcoming UNMIL transition workshop. We also agreed on a lessons-learned paper to be presented at that workshop. One of the main objectives of my coming trip will be to participate in the workshop and to continue discussions with the Government on the issue.

The process of national reconciliation is another example of an area where the PBC is playing a supportive role. A key purpose of my next mission is to participate in the national conference at which the road map for national healing and reconciliation will be endorsed. My main contribution will be to advocate for an inclusive process.

As Chair of the configuration, I will continue to do my best to mobilize the political support and resources required for building sustainable peace in Liberia. We are already working with the Government of Liberia, with the partners in the configuration and with the United Nations system. I look forward to building a strong partnership with the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ms. Karin Landgren, and to

our working together with the international financial institutions and bilateral partners.

Political will is fundamental. Part of the PBC's political backing will be to support continuing political commitment to inclusive governance, political reform, gender and women as agents for change, and inclusive national reconciliation. The statement of mutual commitments is a useful basis for this dialogue and also a mutual accountability mechanism. It also implies a political and budgetary commitment on the part of the Government of Liberia. Budgetary allocations for security and justice, including the police sector, should increase. I plan to discuss resource mobilization, including budgetary allocations, with the Liberian Government during my upcoming visit.

In all those efforts, the PBC will benefit from interaction with the Security Council. That is why we welcome this dialogue and express support for a continuation, which would enhance the impact and weight of our advocacy efforts.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Mr. Seger (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the efforts you have made to bring this important, and indeed essential, debate before the Security Council.

As we heard this morning, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is still facing considerable challenges, almost seven years since it was established. As Chair of the Burundi configuration, I fully endorse the statement made this morning by the Chair of the PBC, Ambassador Momen. I would like to add some personal reflections on relations between the Security Council and the PBC, particularly with regard to specific configurations. Let us bear in mind that it was the Security Council, together with the General Assembly, that established the PBC in 2005. Today, the question still remains as to how cooperation between the Council and the PBC can be strengthened. To answer that question, I believe a number of points should be clarified.

First – something we saw this morning – the process of peacebuilding is basically carried out by the countries on the PBC's agenda. Ownership of that process by the Governments in question is one of the key factors for success. Unlike the Security Council, the PBC does not wield any decision-making powers. We cannot adopt resolutions or impose sanctions on the countries under consideration. As Chair of a configuration, I would compare my role to that of a co-pilot guiding the captain of a large ship. It is the captain who is at the helm, but I advise him on the course to take and the obstacles to avoid. Our only means are spoken ones: good advice and persuasion.

But even without such so-called instruments of power, the work of the PBC is bearing fruit. In the case of Burundi, the situation has stabilized considerably. The country has made great progress, although considerable challenges remain. By the way, that is why, in my opinion, we have all continued to support that country, particularly in supporting resource mobilization. In that regard, I greatly appreciate the help of the World Bank and the African Development Bank. I should take this opportunity to recall that, on 29 and 30 October, we will hold a donors' conference in support of Burundi in Geneva, in which I invite all here to participate.

Secondly, the added value that the Commission brings – compared, for example, with the complementary activities of the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General — is that it speaks in the name of the State. As Chair of the configuration, the power and persuasiveness of my words depend greatly upon the support I receive from the configuration's other members.

Thirdly, the configurations can, in my view, lighten and supplement the work of the Council by supporting and providing an appropriate framework for post-conflict States. We can thus act as a sort of safety net on the Council's behalf. If the situation in the countries on the PBC's agenda is stable, the Council does not need to worry about them. On the other hand, if it deteriorates, the PBC is there to alert the Council. However, in order to fully perform that supplementary role, the PBC needs the support of the Security Council. Above all, it needs political support for the country under the configuration's consideration, but it also needs support and recognition as an institution. Better institutional interaction between the Security Council and the PBC through its configurations would benefit both bodies. That would begin with a more systematic involvement on the part of the configuration Chairs in the drafting of resolutions concerning countries on the PBC's agenda. Their inclusion in that process by certain members of the Council is greatly appreciated, but it remains entirely informal and largely dependent

on the goodwill of the country in charge of a particular area.

Beyond that, I would like to suggest that the Security Council seriously consider issuing a standing invitation to the configuration Chairs to take part in briefings and consultations concerning their countries. For instance, I appreciate the opportunity to brief the Council on the situation in Burundi. I feel we could derive even more benefit if the exercise were interactive. Participation in consultations would considerably facilitate my work by giving me first-hand information and crucial analysis, enabling me to carry out my mandate more effectively. It would also allow members of the Security Council to ask me questions and get my opinion, should they need it.

The PBC's work is triangular, involving cooperation with the Governments of the countries on its agenda and with the United Nations on the ground. In the area of peacebuilding, the country-specific configurations can support not only the work of the Governments concerned but also of United Nations missions in the field under Security Council mandates. I believe that close cooperation between the executive and Special Representatives and the configuration Chairs is key to success. The Chairs can play a complementary role to that of the representatives of the Secretary-General and can help lighten their workload, without in any way acting as substitutes for the representatives in their role.

One final point should be considered in our efforts to strengthen the work of the PBC. Given that gathering information about the countries on the Commission's agenda remains a challenge for all the Chairs, more support from Peacebuilding Support Office and the Department of Political Affairs would be a welcome remedy. I fully understand that the Support Office has very limited human resources, and I would like to express my deep gratitude to them for their efforts. But simply making political analyses formally available through the Secretariat would greatly facilitate our work.

To conclude, almost seven years after the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission and two years after its initial review, we find ourselves at a critical moment.

If the Security Council considers it to be a useful body, I believe that the time has come to invest more in it so as to extract its full potential. I welcome the opportunity to discuss that matter further tomorrow with all members of the Council during our interactive dialogue.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Japan.

Mr. Yamazaki (Japan): I would like to offer my sincere congratulations to Colombia on its presidency of the Security Council and commend its decision to take up the important issue o ,ost-conflict peacebuilding.

Japan is a strong believer in peacebuilding. We have long stressed the need for seamless support, from peace and security to reconstruction and development, and have made peacebuilding one of the central pillars of our international cooperation. Although there is no doubt that national ownership is central to all processes of peacebuilding, we believe that regional cooperation and international support are crucial to ensuring an environment conducive to peace consolidation. With that in mind, Japan has attached great importance to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). Japan has been a long-standing member of the Organizational Committee of the PBC, has served as Chair of the Commission, and is currently Chair of its Working Group on Lessons Learned.

Since its creation over six years ago, the Peacebuilding Commission has addressed the complex peacebuilding challenges faced by countries in the post-conflict phase. The role of the PBC is to facilitate and provide complementary support to the peace efforts of countries emerging from conflict through political accompaniment, the coordination of actors, and the marshaling of resources.

Despite the subtle and often low-profile nature of its work, the concrete impact of the PBC's support has been felt in the countries on its agenda, as was highlighted by Ambassador Abulkaram Abdul Momen, Chair of the PBC. Japan, as Chair of the Working Group on Lessons Learned since 2011, has endeavoured to extract lessons from the experiences of the countries of the country-specific configurations, as well as from those of other countries and regions. The Working Group has covered various topics that are crucial to peacebuilding efforts, including security sector reform, resource mobilization and youth employment, to name a few.

Despite those efforts, differences remain in the understanding of the work of the PBC, which needs to be overcome. Sharing a common understanding

is particularly important in light of the fact that the Commission draws its strength from a diverse membership, which allows it to leverage political, financial and technical capacities as it endeavours to align issues of peace and security with economic development.

In its meeting last December, the Working Group on Lessons Learned tried to address the need to share a common understanding among the different actors by focusing on the PBC's relationship with one of its crucial partners, the Security Council. The discussions at the meeting generated a number of concrete ideas with which to further pursue the interaction between those two entities, such as, inter alia, more frequent recourse by the Security Council to informal interactive dialogue with the country-specific configuration Chairs, and a possible adaptation of the Council's troop-contributing country meeting model to the interaction between the Council and the PBC.

Japan believes that the time has come to collectively consider some of the ways in which the country-specific configurations of the PBC could substantively contribute to the work of the Security Council. My delegation strongly hopes that today's deliberations will provide a timely and useful input to the discussions on that topic. For that, we are most grateful to the Colombian presidency.

We also recognize that there is room for the PBC to fully live up to its important mandated role. The PBC needs to be a forum in which the resources and attention of the international community are further enhanced for the countries on its agenda. The working methods of the PBC could be improved to make it easier for each of the Member States to actively take part in the work of the Commission. Greater synergies between the Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund, to which Japan is a major contributor, should be seriously pursued. Coordination among the United Nations system organizations would inevitably need to be addressed.

That having been said, we must not forget that the PBC is an evolving body. It should reflect, learn and adapt itself in order to achieve the ultimate goal of bringing a better and peaceful life to the people on the ground. It is the wish of the Government of Japan that today's open debate will be an important step in this evolving process. Japan remains strongly committed to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, as it works in close cooperation with the Security Council.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Burundi.

Mr. Ndabishuriye (Burundi) (*spoke in French*): Inscribed on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) since it was first created, Burundi has benefitted from its significant support in a number of key areas, including political and institutional matters, the promotion of good governance, human rights and the state of law, the socio-economic reintegration of vulnerable groups, the mobilization and coordination of international aid, and regional integration.

With respect to political and institutional matters, a number of legal instruments have been put in place to clean up the political climate and improve institutional functioning. Among these, we note the law governing the organization and behaviour of political parties, the code of public administration and the law governing political opposition, which is before Parliament. We also note the establishment of a standing forum for dialogue among political partners

Concerning good governance, human rights and the rule of law, the PBC helped in the creation of several key mechanisms, such as the National Independent Human Rights Commission, in accordance with the Paris Principles, and the office of ombudsman and the Independent National Electoral Commission. Gender issues have also enjoyed substantial attention during all phases of institutional implementation, with the result that women currently make up 50 per cent of Parliament and 43 per cent of the Government.

Moreover, the penal code was reviewed to ensure that it addresses human rights violations and the protection of vulnerable groups. Among the results of that review, we would point out that just last month our prisons were emptied thanks to presidential pardons that benefitted a number of detainees.Despite their relevance to national reconciliation, certain transitional justice mechanisms, such as truth and reconciliation commissions, have not been put in place for lack of means.

The PBC did remarkable work in conceiving and financing the implementation of the national strategy for the socio-economic reintegration of people affected by conflict. Of that programme's $24 million budget, the PBC contributed $9.2 million. Arising from the

need to stabilize the country after more than a decade of conflict, that programme is aimed at demobilized former combatants, displaced persons, returnees, orphans, the war-wounded and all other people affected by conflict. To settle disputes over land and other matters resulting from the dark periods in Burundi's history, we established a commission on land and other property, which has already settled a great many claims.

On his regular, semi-annual visits to the country, the Chair of the Burundi configuration has more than once travelled to Arusha, the seat of the East African Community, where he has had useful exchanges with our partners in that subregional group about helping Burundi with its post-conflict issues. I take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Paul Seger, Chair of the Burundi configuration, for the deep commitment he has always demonstrated to the cause of Burundi. We well know the critical work he is currently doing to move international public opinion towards participating in the next donors' conference in order to help Burundi in its fight against poverty.

To conclude, my delegation would like to ask the Council to continue supporting the PBC and to promote more active interaction between the Council and the PBC. It would be mutually instructive for the Chairs of the configurations and the countries on the PBC's agenda to be systematically invited to Council meetings whenever an agenda item concerns them.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Liberia.

Mr. Dennis (Liberia): Permit me, at the outset, to express my warm appreciation to the Security Council, and in particular to the presidency of the Council for this month, Colombia, for convening this important debate on post- conflict peacebuilding. I also commend the Secretary-General, as well as Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for their respective statements. Similarly, I would like to welcome Ms. María Ángela Holguín Cuéllar, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia. Her presence here to personally preside over this debate is a clear indication of the importance Colombia attaches to post-conflict peacebuilding.

The fifth report of the PBC (S/2012/70) shows that the PBC is a work in progress, as it builds on the activities undertaken in previous years. I commend Ambassador Gasana, under whose leadership the report was prepared, and I thank him for his statement. We take note of the 2012 road map and wish to express our gratitude to the Commission for its commitment to sustaining peace.

Military interventions in the form of peacekeeping missions have a crucial stabilizing effect. That does not necessarily mean, however, that peace in all its aspects is achieved when peacekeepers are deployed to placate a violent situation. While such interventions do end violence and create a stable environment for civility and order, real and tangible peace is realized when basic structures, institutions and capacities are restored.

Post-conflict peacebuilding is a demanding task. It is time-consuming, requires tremendous human endeavour and exacts massive financial resources. The reason, as we all know, is that conflicts leave in their aftermath colossal destruction of basic economic and social structures, a lack of basic safety and security, justice and the rule of law, deficient financial resources and limited institutional capacity. Addressing those mammoth problems requires a profound understanding of the conflict situation. Post-conflict peacebuilding should endeavour to address the underlying causes of the conflict. The strategies required to secure a stable and an enduring peace must be ingrained first and foremost in encouraging political will, an inclusive process of identification and prioritization of the peacebuilding imperatives and ensuring national ownership and leadership of the peacebuilding effort.

Beyond the expertise required to address peacebuilding initiatives, including collaboration with national partners, international institutions, Member States and regional groups, funding peacebuilding initiatives has been a critical challenge. The role of the international community is most crucial in addressing that challenge.

The PBC was created only a few years ago, and there are already important lessons that can be drawn from its activities. Through the country configurations and the support of the Peacebuilding Support Office, the Commission is breaking new ground for engagement, in synergy with national leadership and relevant stakeholders, which can be used to guide its future interventions. Undoubtedly, the PBC's engagement with the countries on its agenda has produced concrete benefits. In the case of Liberia, the PBC's engagement has been very constructive. In the targeted areas of the rule of law, security sector reform and national reconciliation, significant progress has been made. In

the rule of law sector, judicial reform is taking place, and a land reform commission has been established. Courts are being rehabilitated, magistrates trained and pre-trial detention has decreased. Under security sector reform, progress has been made aimed at establishing a credible security presence throughout the country. A national security reform and intelligence act intended to rationalize the security sector has been adopted. Justice and security hubs are being constructed with the aim of decentralizing security and ensuring access to justice. The first hub is ready for operation, and plans are under way to begin the construction on the second hub. Police reform is ongoing, and significant progress has been made.

We have recently been concentrating on national reconciliation, and a validation exercise on the strategic road map for reconciliation is now taking place. The road map aligns national reconciliation with the implementation of the country's national vision. National identity and national healing have been highlighted as primary concerns for national cohesion. We acknowledge the decisive role of the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office in those achievements.

In conclusion, the United Nations must be applauded for according post-conflict peacebuilding the importance and urgency it deserves, especially in the past decade. Its approach embodies the realization and recognition that, while peacekeeping, especially in a violent conflict, prevents further carnage, sustaining the peace is critical to maintaining stability in post-conflict and fragile countries and to avoiding relapse into conflict. Support for the PBC is therefore crucial. We believe that that support should begin with enhanced interaction between the Commission and the Council, as such interaction will narrow the information gap and allow the Council to take advantage of the PBC's expertise and advice.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Kamara (Sierra Leone): Let me at the outset thank the Colombian presidency for convening today's meeting. Let me also thank the Secretary-General for his very instructive statement.

Sierra Leone warmly welcomes the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70), which accurately reflects, inter alia, the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in Sierra Leone. We appreciate the continued support of the PBC's country configurations for countries on the Commission's agenda, which have provided political advocacy and support, fostered coherence among key actors and intensified efforts aimed at resource mobilization.

The initiation of activities by the Commission to strengthen its impact and give added value, both in the field and as a policy platform for the development of United Nations peacebuilding norms and more, is commendable.

In that context, we encourage the Commission to continue interacting with international financial institutions, regional organizations and operational actors of the United Nations system in order to strengthen partnerships and coordinate activities with a view towards enhancing complementarity and coherence among actors in the countries on the agenda. That is important, as it has the potential to strengthen the Commission's efforts in political advocacy, resource mobilization and addressing transnational organized crime and drug trafficking.

The adoption of statements of mutual commitments in Liberia and Guinea as the new instruments for engagement underscores the advantages of a single overarching planning document that sets forth well-defined peacebuilding elements. It is also a step towards adapting to the changing needs of the countries on the PBC agenda. Along those lines, the Commission should take into account the transitional phases of peacebuilding and seamlessly adopt appropriate forms of engagement at every phase.

We urge the Commission to continue building on its contributions to the work of the Senior Advisory Group, in particular in improving the United Nations contribution to strengthening national capacities for peacebuilding. The fundamental principle of national ownership and the importance of supporting nationally driven processes, including civilian capacity development and institution- building, will no doubt broaden and deepen the pool of civilian expertise in peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. In that regard, the Commission should monitor and make recommendations on the implementation of the Secretary-General's civilian capacity review and assess its practical implications for national capacity-building in critical peacebuilding priority areas.

It is clear that countries emerging from conflict need an institution like the PBC to serve as a platform to support them with advice and assistance to raise their profile internationally, build trust and dialogue among the various national stakeholders and mobilize financial resources for immediate and long-term peacebuilding priorities, including support for democratic and governance institutions.

However, the PBC's record on resource mobilization remains mixed. In that regard, the PBC should consider what the appropriate goals in the area of resource mobilization should be, including whether it can also make a contribution in other areas, such as aid management, aid coordination, technical assistance and outreach to the philanthropic and private sectors. In that respect, the wider membership of the Peacebuilding Commission should work with it to identify clearer ways in which they can concretely contribute to peacebuilding in the countries on the agenda.

The role of the Peacebuilding Support Office remains crucial for the Commission's efficient functioning by providing assistance in the development of instruments of engagement and the assessment of progress achieved in meeting commitments made therein, as well as unblocking obstacles and identifying opportunities for resource mobilization.

Sierra Leone was placed on the PBC's agenda on 23 June 2006, following a referral from the Security Council. To date, the PBC has worked with the Government and with international and local partners to address the country's peacebuilding priorities. Since then, our engagement with the PBC has been fruitful, and as noted in the PBC report, the Commission, working through the Sierra Leone configuration, has made tremendous progress in its peacebuilding efforts, chiefly through aligning the peacebuilding elements of the Agenda for Change with the joint vision of the United Nations country team and resource mobilization efforts.

The Agenda for Change provides a strong partnership link between Sierra Leone, the United Nations and the donor community. Its implementation has so far had a great impact on peacebuilding and in laying the foundation for opening the path to sustainable development and peace consolidation. Furthermore, through the country-specific configuration and the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone, the PBC has provided a platform for enhanced dialogue among political parties and all national stakeholders with a clear commitment to ensuring durable peace and stability. Sierra Leone's approach is considered today to be a best practice in the area of donor coordination.

Through engagement with the PBC, the Peacebuilding Fund released about $35 million in 2007 as catalytic funding to support well-defined peacebuilding initiatives, including reparations for war victims, the establishment of the Human Rights Commission, the provision of emergency support to the energy sector, youth enterprise development, good governance and the rule of law, and the delivery of public services. That funding was followed by a second envelope of $7 million, which was dedicated, inter alia, to enhancing political dialogue and the participation of civil society in the political process leading up to the 2012 elections. Those programmes of support essentially contributed to creating visible peace dividends, and their impact on peacebuilding is invaluable. We therefore urge Member States that are in a position to contribute to the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) to invest in achieving durable peace and stability.

Clearly, the role of the PBC, with support from the PBSO and the PBF, remains crucial in preventing countries from relapsing into conflict. There is, however, a need to develop more synergy between the PBF, the PBSO and the PBC.

The New Deal, recently agreed in Busan, as well as the publication of the *World Development Report 2011* and ongoing work on peacebuilding at the United Nations, provide an opportunity for countries undergoing transition or post-conflict recovery to have their voices, perspectives and needs better heard at the United Nations. The Peacebuilding Commission as a whole should serve as a global platform for these discussions, while the country-specific configurations should provide political support for field-level implementation.

The Chair of the Sierra Leone country-configuration, Ambassador Guillermo Rishchynski, visited Sierra Leone in January. His report and briefing of the configuration underscored progress made in addressing key peacebuilding priorities and the need for enduring support, particularly in the area of youth unemployment and empowerment, building police capacity, and the need for strong private sector growth that could translate into more tangible peace dividends

and sustainable peace consolidation. We believe that the Security Council team that visited Sierra Leone in May also shares similar views on progress made and the need for support to address present challenges.

Let me, at this juncture, express Sierra Leone's gratitude to the Chair and members of the Sierra Leone configuration, as well as other international partners, for their unreserved commitment to achieving Sierra Leone's peacebuilding objectives, along with our development transformation goals.

In conclusion, as one of the first countries on the PBC's agenda, Sierra Leone has charted a path for others to potentially learn from. This has involved adjusting early approaches in order to make more effective use of PBF resources, lower the bureaucratic burden placed on Government, and better align United Nations efforts with national priorities. It has also entailed a shift in perspective away from heavy field-level engagement with an operational focus to a more political role that concentrates on how the PBC can serve as an international platform for advocacy and action on all aspects of peacebuilding.

Finally, strengthening peacebuilding will better enable countries to avoid relapsing into conflict and to sustain peace beyond the life of peacekeeping missions. It will also ensure that the enormous investments that Member States make in peacekeeping will achieve their intended results. In its short existence, the peacebuilding architecture has proven its worth, as envisaged by the leaders at the 2005 World Summit, whose goal was to help countries emerging from conflict make an irreversible transition from war to sustainable peace.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Chile.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation congratulates you, Madam, on your Colombia's presidency of the Security Council for this month, and expresses its gratitude for the invitation to participate in this debate, which will contribute to strengthened relations between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

We also thank the Secretary-General and the representatives of the World Bank and the African Development Bank for their statements. Their participation clearly demonstrates the importance of partnerships with entities that participate on the ground and provide a regional view.

I also thank Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana, Permanent Representative of Rwanda, for his statement as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission for 2011. We appreciate the thorough report on the activities of the PBC during its fifth session (S/2012/70). We also appreciate the statement made by Mr. Momen, Permanent Representative of Bangladesh and current Chair of the PBC, for the very valuable information provided on the work of the Commission in the past year.

We acknowledge the work of the Chairs of the country-specific configurations and express our appreciation of the work of Ms. Judy Cheng-Hopkins, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support, and her Office for their assistance to the PBC and its various configurations.

My delegation associates itself with the statement to be made by the Permanent Representative of Tunisia in his country's capacity as coordinator of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for the Peacebuilding Commission.

My delegation recognizes the significant efforts undertaken to advance the implementation of the recommendations set forth in the 2010 review (S/2010/393, annex), in particular progress in the interaction between the Commission and the main United Nations organs, especially the Security Council.

My delegation would like to highlight the important participation of the Chairs of the respective configurations and the representatives of the countries involved in the discussion of the mandates of a political mission or peacekeeping operation. Nevertheless, my country believes that there is still room for ongoing progress in that direction and, in a fluid and informal context, for the discussion of peacebuilding issues of interest to the Security Council. In that regard, it may be possible to assess that relationship within the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. While these are two completely different aspects of the process in post-conflict countries, they are also two sides of the same coin. Chile reaffirms the need to put into institutional practice the recommendations of the 2010 review, which point to the need for a more informal and fluid relationship with the Security Council.

On a different note, my country highlights the work done over the past year with respect to global, regional, subregional and international organizations, especially the partnership established with the African

Development Bank and the closer ties with the World Bank. My delegation believes these steps to be particularly important in the Commission's outreach efforts. Moreover, we highlight the high-level meeting of post-conflict countries that took place in Rwanda last November. The experiences of such countries are critical inputs to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Women and young people are at the heart of the Commission's activities, and have been since its inception. Chile values the meeting with the Executive Board of UN Women and supports its conclusions, especially with regard to activating a dialogue with UN Women at the level of specific configurations concerning priorities that will promote the greater participation of women in peacebuilding processes from the outset.

The Commission's report rightly points to the current international financial situation, which is already having an impact on aid flows to the countries on the PBC's agenda. With a view to mitigating the effects of the crisis, Chile believes that it is important to study ways to promote a deeper relationship and to strengthen joint initiatives with the private sector.

Finally, we urge the Commission to continue working on the development of a communications strategy that will make it possible to disseminate information to a greater number of institutions and people concerning the work and objectives of the Commission.

My country believes that the PBC is the best platform for intergovernmental advice, leadership, and the development of peacebuilding expertise and practices.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the Head of the Delegation of the European Union.

Mr. Mayr-Harting (European Union): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States.

The acceding country Croatia; the candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Iceland and Serbia; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia, align themselves with this statement.

I thank you, Madam President, for having organized today's important debate revolving around the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on its fifth session (S/2012/70). We were grateful for the Secretary-General's statement, and I would like in particular to thank the former and current Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassadors Gasana and Momen, respectively, for their statements and for everything they have done and are doing in the interests of peacebuilding. I also thank the Colombian presidency for having put forward the concept note for today's discussion (S/2012/511, annex).

It is important to take stock at least once a year of the activities carried out by the Peacebuilding Commission. This is a healthy exercise to assess the achievements registered over the past months, to draw lessons learned from the shortcomings, and to further elaborate on the immediate challenges requiring our collective attention.

In terms of progress, we should note that during the period under review, the PBC carried out a series of important outreach activities and that the coherence between it and the Peacebuilding Fund has been strengthened in some cases. The report also portrays some positive developments achieved by the continued engagement of the country-specific configurations in supporting the six countries on the PBC agenda. The configurations, whose work is very important, have endeavoured to provide political guidance aimed at coherence among key players pursuing nationally owned peacebuilding priorities.

The placement of Guinea on the PBC agenda in February last year and the progress witnessed thus far in that country on security sector reform, on the launch of a pension scheme for 4,000 military personnel with the Peacebuilding Fund, and on deployment of civilian expertise, as well as the appointment of an advisor on security sector reform, are also positive steps.

Still, great challenges ahead remain. Our determined efforts to release the PBC's full potential to overcome those challenges needs to continue. Important test cases are the November elections in Sierra Leone and national reconciliation in Liberia. The situation in Guinea-Bissau is also extremely precarious, and we need to step up our efforts for a return of constitutional normalcy and to loosen the military grip on civilian power through a genuine security sector reform process.

We believe that the PBC has a key role to play in those areas.

We believe that the PBC is now in a second critical phase of its life, and there is need to re-energize political commitment to that body. In this context, we fully welcome some encouraging developments witnessed recently. For instance, the recent meeting of the PBC Chairs' Group and the meeting of the Executive or Special Representatives of the Secretary-General of PBC countries was an excellent initiative to have a frank discussion on how to reinvigorate the relationship between both. We sincerely hope that this dialogue will continue in the future.

We are also very grateful to the United Kingdom for having put forward a thoughtful non-paper aimed at strengthening the role of the PBC and seeking a more interactive relationship with the Council. The benefits of an enhanced and more organic relationship between the Security Council and the PBC are increasingly being recognized, and the potential exists to create a new dynamic between a more forthcoming Security Council and a better-performing Peacebuilding Commission. We also hope that the interactive dialogue between the PBC Chairs and Council members scheduled for tomorrow may bring issues forward.

Similarly, we are also buoyed by the dynamics surrounding the PBC configuration of Liberia, including through the appointment of a new full-time Chair and a new Special Representative of the Security-General in Monrovia. This should facilitate a common understanding of both roles and a good complementarity with the New Deal initiative of the g7+.

Finally, we are very glad to acknowledge that peacebuilding and prevention figure prominently in the action agenda set out by the Secretary-General for his second term. In that context, we look forward to the Secretary-General's upcoming report on post-conflict peacebuilding, due at a later stage this year.

Having said this, let us not forget the most important aspect – national ownership. Peacebuilding will succeed only if it is home-grown and nationally led. Our duty as the international community must consist in aligning behind nationally owned strategies.

To conclude, peacebuilding is a very complex and multifaceted challenge. It is a work in progress, and we are still learning by doing. In this context, we firmly believe that the PBC has a pivotal role to play. Its strength comes directly from its nature as the unique intergovernmental advisory body to the Security Council, but so do its limitations as a New York-based platform.

The EU and its member states stand ready to continue supporting efforts to enable the United Nations peacebuilding architecture to live up to the expectations that accompanied its establishment, and I wish to assure the Council of the commitment of the European Union and its member States to the continued work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium.

Mr. Grauls (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank you, Madam President, for the opportunity to address the Security Council during this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding.

Belgium aligns itself with the statement that has just been made on behalf of the European Union.

I will not elaborate on the annual report (S/2012/70) of the Peacebuilding Commission, which provides a factual overview of the activities of the Commission and its configurations, but I would like to focus on the relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, which relates to the third question in the concept note. The few points I want to share with members of the Security Council are inspired by my previous role as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission country-specific configuration for the Central African Republic.

Looking back at the past few years, one has to conclude that relations between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission can without doubt be significantly improved. This relationship has certainly not yet achieved its full potential and could be deepened and enriched by a greater interest on the part of the Council in the activities of the Commission and its various configurations. I sincerely believe that the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission deserve more attention on the part of the Council. In that regard, Belgium strongly welcomes the relevant ideas submitted by the United Kingdom in the non-paper that has been circulated.

I would like to underline three points for a strengthened relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. The first concerns the possible role of the Commission, and especially

its configurations, in the preparatory phase of the deliberations that the Council holds on countries on its agenda. The second concerns the role played by the Commission and its configurations in the follow-up to the Council's deliberations. The third and last point is about the relationship between the Commission and the subsidiary organs of the Council, which is often neglected.

First and foremost, I am convinced that the Security Council could pay more attention to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission in the preparatory phase of its own deliberations on a country on its agenda. During that phase, the Council could in particular address concrete requests for the opinion of the Chairs of the various country-specific configurations on such topics as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security sector reform, socio-economic development, gaps in the peacebuilding agenda or any other issue concerning peacebuilding. This would in turn allow the Chairs to make more relevant and certainly more specific contributions and to offer greater added value when addressing the Council.

My experience with the Central African Republic taught me that it is extremely useful for a configuration to visit the country a few weeks ahead of the Council's deliberations. Such visits, at the right moment and carefully timed to the Council's agenda, would allow configurations to brief the Council as accurately as possible on the issues that the Council would have already asked it to investigate in detail. I do not see why the Council could not suggest that a configuration Chair travel to the country in question ahead of a discussion in the Council. The Council could also ask Chairs to focus on specific questions linked to peacebuilding during their visits on the ground. It is clear that advice given on this basis by configurations could end up in the resolutions and decisions that the Council often adopts at the end of its deliberations. One is forced to conclude that the peacebuilding dimension is still too often omitted from the Council's decisions.

This brings me to my second point. My experience as Chair of the Central African Republic configuration has taught me that any reference to peacebuilding in a Security Council decision helps to reinforce the work of the configuration and is also taken very seriously by the country under consideration.

I therefore take this opportunity to urge that more references to peacebuilding concerns be included more frequently in the Council's decisions. The configuration Chairs could also function as an echo of the Council's decisions during their visits to the countries concerned and pass on its policy messages through their contact with the countries' authorities. This would also improve coherence between the configuration and the Council-mandated United Nations missions on the ground. We have learned from experience that in some cases senior United Nations representatives on the ground do not share the views of configuration members. Coordinated guidance from the Council could help to avoid such situations.

Lastly, I would like to briefly emphasize that there is room for improvement in the cooperation between the Peacebuilding Commission and other subsidiary organs of the Security Council. On several occasions, as Chair of the country-specific configuration for the Central African Republic, I briefed the Council's Working Group on Children and Armed Conflict on the findings of my visits on the ground. This relationship between configurations and some of the Council's subsidiary organs is still too often neglected. In the same spirit, I had very close contact with the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict and on Sexual Violence in Conflict. I am convinced that such interaction was very useful and should even be intensified.

In conclusion, I reaffirm my conviction that the critical relationship between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission can be considerably strengthened, and that any initiative to that end on the part of the Security Council would be greatly appreciated by the configurations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Croatia.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered on behalf of the European Union a few minutes ago, but I would also like to make some brief remarks in my national capacity.

Let me begin by thanking the Secretary-General for his thoughtful remarks on this important issue. I would also like to thank Ambassador Gasana, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for his able leadership of the Commission in 2011 and introduction of the report of the Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70), as well as the current Chair, Ambassador Momen, for his remarks, which we agree with fully.

Finally, let me thank the representative of the World Bank for his valuable insights and contributions.

The PBC report that we are discussing today, especially where it touches on the country-specific configurations, is testament to the Commission's ongoing effort to support national actors in taking full ownership of and leading the peacebuilding process in their countries. As reflected in the outcome of the first review, in 2010, of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (S/2010/393, annex), the PBC's main tasks can be summarized in three major areas: political accompaniment, resource mobilization and coordination. Accordingly, the Commission's accomplishments in these areas should serve as a basis for thorough analysis of its achievements in the most recent reporting period, as well as for evaluating its contribution and added value.

In that regard, it is essential to start with the important work of the Commission's operative components, the country-specific configurations. Their considerable achievements in the area of political rapprochement, electoral process, capacity development and institution-building are undeniable, although, it sometimes seems, not always advertised enough. Furthermore, the Commission's notable efforts to achieve more substantial engagement in peacebuilding activities on the part of international financial institutions, and to incorporate peacebuilding needs and priorities into the development agenda deserve full recognition and more support.

All those achievements testify to the Commission's ambition and ability to serve as a political platform for nationally owned prioritization, mobilizing highly needed support in whatever form it may come, and maintaining a continuing international focus on national peacebuilding priorities and goals.

At the same time, I would like to stress the importance that Croatia attaches to new, inclusive and representative global partnerships, bringing together traditional donors and new ones, who often share experience similar to that of the nations they are ready to support. In that regard, we closely follow emerging new initiatives and related pilot projects aimed at further promoting South-South and triangular cooperation, and efforts to develop appropriate indicators to help measure progress in priority areas, as well as to advance issues relating to accountability, transparency and a result-oriented approach. We hope that mutual influences and possible interaction between such initiatives and activities of the PBC and its configurations will inject new enthusiasm and vitality into ongoing and future peacebuilding efforts.

In that context, and bearing in mind the particular importance of capacity-building in countries emerging from conflict, let me add that Croatia attaches significant importance to the follow-up to the recent civilian capacity review and the establishment of CapMatch, a global platform aimed at producing more demand-oriented, partnership-based, flexible and effective mechanisms for the transfer of civilian skills and knowledge to national actors. We consider the re-establishment of those skills and that knowledge at the national level to be a crucial component of every post-conflict peacebuilding effort, and one of the major guarantees that fragile societies will not slide back into conflict and desperation. We are particularly interested in seeing that platform function efficiently in all the countries on the PBC's agenda. Croatia will do its part in that regard.

With regard to the Commission's performance at Headquarters and its relations with key actors, including the principal United Nations organs and operational bodies, it is clear that that area, which has been somewhat neglected, needs further deliberations and will benefit, it is to be hoped, from considerable improvement. For example, it is obvious that the Commission, by providing its opinion and advice on established priority areas in the countries on its agenda, could significantly contribute to the Council's analysis, deliberations and final decisions, especially during preparations for the Council's visits to those countries, as well as to the establishment of mandates, their renewal or alteration, and to other decisions regarding the United Nations engagement in those countries. In that regard, we fully support requests for further strengthening the relationship between the Council and the Commission and its appropriate institutionalization.

One good starting point, as suggested by Ambassador Momen in his statement, would be periodic information- sharing meetings between the Council and country-specific configurations, which should be held quarterly.

At the same time, it has become obvious, that, as the concept note states, in this "crowded and somewhat fragmented field of operational actors in the countries on its agenda" (*S/2012/511, annex, para. 11*), there needs

to be a clearly articulated division of labour and mutual cooperation among different components of the United Nations presence on the ground. Such an approach would not only render the United Nations messages and engagement more focused and efficient, but show leadship by example in that rather difficult component of international assistance, and the United Nations would strengthen its credibility and fully reaffirm its leading role.

I will conclude by quoting the Secretary-General, who recently said that peacebuilding is a task involving many actors, and I am tempted to add, "a task with many faces". Only through genuine political commitment on the part of Governments, especially those participating in the diverse membership of the PCB, non-governmental organizations, the private sector and local society, and by bearing in mind that no one solution fits all situations, can we hope to seize the right moment and choose the right tools in order to help societies leave their troubles behind and find a brighter and more advantageous future.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): I would like to thank you, Madam President, for convening this debate. We welcome the statements from the previous speakers, including the interventions from Ambassadors Momen and Gasana. We agree with the assessment that the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has yet to meet its full potential and that we need to do better. We support the ideas put forward in relation to the relationship between the PBC and the Security Council and also the interesting point — made, I believe, by the representative of Germany — that the link between the PBC's work and the post-2015 development agenda should be strengthened.

I would like to focus on three areas that we see as critical to the work of the Commission going forward.

The first is enhancing the Commission's impact in the field, which was obviously one of the over-arching themes of the 2010 review, which is easy to talk about but very difficult to achieve, as we know. Obviously, building better linkages with actors in the field — the "many faces" — is an important part of the solution. The PBC must look at how it can best support the work of United Nations missions and country teams — the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, the executive representatives of the Secretary-General and the Resident Coordinators. The relationships between country configurations and field actors need much more clarification and strengthening.

We must ensure that policy discussions here in New York translate into practical coordination on the ground and also reflect realities on the ground. As Member States, we need to maintain dialogue with all elements of the United Nations system to ensure coherence. We must look carefully at the PBC's comparative advantages. They include its advocacy role and its nature as a Member State-based organization with a unique composition. The PBC has an ability to convene diverse stakeholders. It needs to look at more active engagement of multilateral, bilateral and regional actors, including in the field.

Resource mobilization is also vital to increasing the impact in the field, that is very difficult, of course; it is the most difficult aspect of all. The new approach taken by the PBC and the peacebuilding force in Liberia, in developing an Expanded Priority Plan linked to the Statement of Mutual Commitments, seems very instructive. We encourage country configurations to map international assistance and to find more effective avenues for support from funding partners.

My second point is the importance of supporting national ownership, which must be the central organizing principle. The PBC has shown time and again that it works best when it is working in support of nationally determined priorities. We support efforts to better and more specifically define commitments between the PBC and countries on its agenda, to make them more measurable and align them more closely with national priorities. We welcome efforts in New York to involve the permanent representatives of the countries on the PBC's agenda more deeply in the Commission's policy work.

My third point relates to the relationship between the Security Council and the PBC. We have consistently urged a closer and more organic relationship between those two bodies. We welcome positive steps in that regard, including enhanced involvement of PBC country configurations in Council discussions. We would encourage more informal dialogue between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, and we very much welcome the interactive dialogue to be held tomorrow as an opportunity for frank discussion. The Council, as one of the PBC's parent organs, should set out clearly its expectations, particularly in relation to

the PBC's advisory role. The Council could make better use of that advisory role, including when it comes to mandate renewals and periods of transition in the United Nations engagement in a country. There is also a role for the PBC in early warning to the Council. As the South African representative remarked earlier, the advice of the PBC should be used at all times when it is relevant.

As Ambassador Momen has emphasized, the PBC needs to be a collective enterprise. My own country is trying to play its part. We were, in fact, the first donor to the Peacebuilding Fund, and I would like to announce a new contribution of $12 million today. We have contributed other amounts in support of the country-specific configurations and made other contributions. There are more details in the statement that I have circulated. I would mention only that in order to help ensure that the PBC is better able to measure impact in the field and to share peacebuilding lessons from our region — the Asia-Pacific — we have produced a report on peacekeeping lessons, focusing on the mistakes my own country made when it sought to help with peacebuilding in Bougainville in the Solomon Islands in Papua New Guinea. That publication was launched last month in New York and is available outside the room.

To conclude, let me say that we take seriously our role in the collective enterprise of building peace. I would like to assure the Council of our ongoing commitment to ensuring that the PBC continues to develop so that it can deliver genuine change to the lives of people in countries emerging from conflict.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Tunisia.

Mr. Jerandi (Tunisia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement regarding the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

I would like, at the outset, to thank you, Madam President, for organizing this important meeting. I also thank the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Permanent Representative of Bangladesh and Chair of the PBC, and Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gusana, the outgoing Chair, for their respective statements.

The Non-Aligned Movement welcomes the opportunity to participate in this open debate so that it can reiterate its strong support for the PBC and its commitment to contribute actively to setting a more coherent and integrated peacebuilding agenda.

The Movement notes with appreciation that the fifth report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2012/70) reflects the progress made so far in taking forward recommendations contained in the report (S/2010/393, annex) of the co-facilitators on the 2010 review process. The Movement also welcomes the ambitious 2012 road map of actions being implemented under the leadership of Ambassador Momen.

Nevertheless, we must recognize, as reflected in the report, that the PBC still faces some important challenges. They include intensifying the nexus between peace and development by further prioritizing economic revitalization and the social dimension of development, entrenching principles of national ownership and developing national capacities. The Commission is also challenged to increase its tangible impact in the field, guaranteeing well-coordinated and coherent actions on the ground and ensuring faster and predictable financing for recovery activities over the medium to long term.

We are also convinced that much more still needs to be done to ensure that peacebuilding is a United Nations-centric term. In that regard, the Movement welcomes the fact that the reporting period witnessed growing interest in the work of the PBC by Member States.

The Movement believes that that growing interest must lead to closer, dynamic and substantive interaction between the PBC and the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Such close interaction will make the United Nations react and deliver as one body when it comes to setting the peacebuilding agenda, on the basis of a better integrated and coherent approach, strengthening joint planning and providing clear definitions of actors' responsibilities, as well as exhaustive details on the respective portfolios to avoid overlap and duplication.

Better coordination of United Nations strategies, actions and messaging indeed requires building stronger synergies between the PBC and other key United Nations bodies, including the operational ones, while maximizing synergies with the Peacebuilding Fund, so that the PBC can play a pivotal role in setting the general policy of the Fund to avoid any gaps in mobilizing resources. To that end, we need to focus our attention on the role of the PBC in providing the

United Nations with policy guidelines and strategies on its peacebuilding activities, to further strengthen interlinkages between security and development.

With its unique membership structure, which includes Member States serving in key United Nations bodies and representing many geographical regions of the world, the Peacebuilding Commission is positioned to be a platform of coordination and of sharing experiences and knowledge, thereby assisting countries in devising and sequencing their own priorities and fulfilling those priorities in the best possible way. In that regard, the PBC should give special attention to the necessity of developing national capacities and further reinforcing institution-building, through the mechanisms and the financial and technical resources needed to do so.

Re-energizing the political support and commitment of Member States is fundamental to realizing the full potential of the PBC, especially as it is exploring the expansion of its agenda. As underlined by the co-facilitators' report on the 2010 review, the review should be a wake-up call to strengthen the collective resolve to deal with peacebuilding in a more comprehensive and determined way.

The unique membership structure of the PBC makes that body a credible actor that the Security Council can rely on in addressing conflict issues. The fact that 9 of the 15 members of the Security Council are currently members of the PBC's Organizational Committee further facilitates a dynamic linkage between the Commission and the Council. In that regard, the Movement reiterates its stress on the following elements relating to the Commission's advisory role with the Security Council.

First, the PBC could play a major role in drawing the Council's attention to situations that might constitute threats to peace and security, especially with regard to the countries on its agenda. It could also benchmark the progression from stabilization to sustainable peace in those countries.

Secondly, the Council should ensure the full participation of the PBC in all discussions falling under the Commission's competencies. That would help the Security Council in effectively playing its critical role in initiating peacebuilding processes in critical areas at an earlier stage.

Thirdly, the prevention role of the PBC should be among the principal pillars of its activities and be further explored. We are convinced that there is room for the Council to take advantage of the full potential preventive role of the existing PBC mandate.

Fourthly, the work of the country-specific configurations must be fully jelled with the overall United Nations objectives of building sustainable peace in the aftermath of conflict by, inter alia, ensuring complete national ownership of all peacebuilding initiatives. The Chairs of the configurations should be provided an opportunity to brief the Security Council and the Organizational Committee of the PBC, to ensure participation and accountability.

Finally, let me reiterate that the Non-Aligned Movement remains strongly committed to supporting the Peacebuilding Commission's efforts in promoting sustainable peace.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Shin Dong Ik (Republic of Korea): I would like to begin by expressing my sincere appreciation to you, Madam President, for the convening of today's open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. My appreciation and warm welcome also goes to Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana of Rwanda, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), as well as the Commission's current Chair, Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen of Bangladesh, and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. I thank them for their statements today. In addition, it is timely and productive to have Mr. Joachim von Amsberg, World Bank Vice-President, participating in today's debate. I believe that this debate will serve to increase understanding of the nature and scope of the PBC's role.

Over the past six years, the Peacebuilding Commission has steadily developed effective methods to carry out its mandates by catalyzing international efforts to assist countries emerging from conflict situations. The fifth annual report of the Commission (S/2012/70), which was prepared through close consultation among Member States and the Peacebuilding Support Office, offers a clear synopsis of the achievements made and the challenges faced by the Commission during its fifth session. That is an important leap ahead, as the report now reflects, for the first time, the progress made in moving forward the relevant recommendations contained in the co-facilitators' report entitled "Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture" (S/2010/393, annex).

Peacebuilding operations should be executed in such a way as to further strengthen and respect national ownership and the priorities of recipient countries. The ultimate goal of peacebuilding is not only to stabilize the post-conflict situation but also to establish a basis for long-term sustainable development. The PBC has had many achievements in the field of political support and advocacy. For example, it has been able to support national capacity development for law enforcement in Liberia since 2011. It also provided effective support to the first round of presidential elections in Guinea-Bissau last March, despite the military coup afterwards, which should be strongly condemned and reversed, as resolution 2048 (2012) articulates. In addition, my delegation would like to stress that strengthening civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict is also critical for achieving and maintaining sustained peace.

The partnership among all stakeholders, within and outside the United Nations system, should also be strengthened, with the PBC playing the role of a facilitator. Particularly, the strategic partnerships of the United Nations with international and regional financial institutions, such as the World Bank and the African Development Bank, are imperative in securing financial resources and effective budget allocation. The recent completion of new poverty reduction strategies in Burundi and the Central African Republic offer a prime opportunity for strengthening the United Nations partnership with the World Bank and the African Development Bank.

Closer linkage and coordination between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission is necessary for carrying out peacebuilding mandates and helping countries to meet multifaceted post-conflict demands in the field. The Council members' visit to Liberia and Sierra Leone in May should be useful in identifying the gaps and difficulties that the PBC is facing on the ground. Such visits also reinforce the Security Council-Peacebuilding Commission relationship in an effective, dynamic, synergistic and forward-thinking manner. When the interrelationship between the two bodies is further strengthened, we will be in a better position for meeting new challenges on the ground as they arise.

In addition, the PBC should develop a systematic way for the Security Council to take better advantage of the lessons learned and assets acquired through the Commission's activities in the six country-specific configurations. The accumulated lessons learned and experiences of each configuration can add valuable perspective to the discussions in the Security Council on countries on the PBC's agenda. However, I would like to note that the configurations, which are the main vehicles for the PBC's activities, are generally under-utilized. I see potential areas where synergy could be created if the configurations' assets are efficiently made part of the discussions in the Security Council. We also believe that more modalities need to be developed to enhance the interactivity between the configurations and the Security Council.

The Republic of Korea has contributed to peacebuilding activities, including serving as a Vice-Chair of the PBC in 2009 and as a member of the Organizational Committee, and donated $4 million to the Peacebuilding Fund since its establishment in 2006. My delegation stands ready to further scale up our contributions to the noble cause of peacebuilding and looks forward to more discussion in the Security Council and the General Assembly on ways to improve the PBC's role with a view towards a more secure and sustainable world.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mrs. Morgan (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia, Ms. María Ángela Holguín Cuéllar, for convening this debate on peacebuilding processes in post-conflict situations. This discussion will contribute to strengthening the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and help make its processes more effective, thereby allowing us to take advantage of lessons learned in the seven years of its existence and improve the coherence, consistency and coordination with other bodies of the United Nations.

Experience in the past few years has shown that promoting social stability is a key part of the process of peacebuilding. Based on the priorities set forth by a country itself, post-conflict strategies should include actions to tackle poverty, unemployment and economic and social inequality, guarantee an appropriate balance between the requirements of reform in the security sector, strengthen the rule of law and attend to the basic needs of the people.

In that regard, Mexico reaffirms the need to stress national ownership throughout the process of peacebuilding and supports the Commission's work plan, which is focused on promoting the development

of national capacity, the mobilization of resources, the grouping of key agents around common objectives for peacebuilding and the adoption of collaboration instruments that are flexible and adapted to the reality of each country.

As a co-facilitator of the 2010 review of the Peacebuilding Commission, Mexico welcomes the progress achieved in complying with the recommendations set forth in the report (S/2011/527) of the Secretary-General, specifically implementing the plan of action to strengthen the Organization's capacity and mechanisms so that it can have greater impact in the field and strengthening the Commission's relations with key operative entities of the United Nations system both at Headquarters and in the field. We also welcome the adoption of General Assembly resolution 66/255, whose objective is to provide continuity in the civilian capacity initiative, which is promoting the development of national capacities, furthers South-South and regional cooperation and increases the participation of women to that end.

That progress also includes efforts to address pending challenges, such as strengthening synergies and associations with other relevant actors at Headquarters and with regional development banks, civil society organizations and national authorities. Moreover, strategies for peacebuilding should be broadened, including going beyond those countries that are on the Commission's agenda.

In that work, it is important to leverage the advice and value added of the Peacebuilding Commission in discussions with the Security Council and to continue promoting the participation of the Chairs of the country-specific configurations in its deliberations. Their contributions should provide high-quality analysis that can contribute to improving the mandates of peacekeeping missions, particularly in transition processes.

For the Commission to be able to fully comply with its mandate, it is necessary that it receive financial resources in a predictable manner through the Peacebuilding Fund. Mexico has voluntarily contributed financially to the Fund and has proposed programmes for electoral training in some post-conflict countries.

In 2010, during the review of the Peacebuilding Commission's work, the central question was identifying the added value that the Commission could bring to the peacebuilding architecture, both within the United Nations and outside of it. Two years after that assessment, Mexico recognizes that the Commission has increased its political weight and its power to bring key agents together. The positive results of the work of some of the country configurations are proof of that.

Mexico will continue to support the Commission so that it can grow in strength as a key tool to mobilize efforts for peacebuilding and reconstruction in countries in post-conflict situations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Ireland.

Ms. Anderson (Ireland): I thank you, Madam President, for scheduling today's debate. A longer version of my statement will be circulated.

It is almost two years to the day since the co-facilitators — of which I was privileged to be one — submitted our review of the operation of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (S/2010/393, annex). The report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) before us today (S/2012/70) collates much useful information on the steps taken throughout 2011. There is also a degree of analysis and honest appraisal.

As always, the commitment of the Chairs — and the dedication of the staff of the Peacebuilding Support Office — shines through. The progress of the past year is in no way to be undervalued, and the European Union statement, with which we are associated, recognizes a number of the advances made. But if I speak today with some sense of impatience, it is not just as a co-facilitator of the 2010 review, but as representative of a country that is a committed and a long-standing supporter of United Nations peacebuilding.

The 2010 review was framed as a wake-up call. The co-facilitators said that

> "either there is a conscious recommitment to peacebuilding at the very heart of the work of the United Nations, or the Peacebuilding Commission settles into the limited role that has developed so far." (*S/2010/393, annex, executive summary*)

Despite the advances to which the 2011 report testifies, it would be hard to feel that the qualitative change the review called for has taken place or is in the process of taking place. We need to put matters in context: there is no room for complacency about any aspect of the peace and security work of the United Nations. The PBC is not a single malfunctioning piece in

otherwise satisfactory and smooth-running machinery. I think we all know the questions that are accumulating about aspects of United Nations peacekeeping. We also need to be conscious of the inherently complex and multifaceted work of peacebuilding. Nevertheless, a few things would benefit from being plainly stated at this stage.

First, as we look at the often crowded field of peacebuilding, we reiterate constantly that what is distinctive about the PBC is its intergovernmental and representative character. It is that intergovernmental character that confers political weight and allows the PBC to bring its specific strengths to bear.

So what is wrong with this picture? The fact is that we as Member States often do not play our part in giving true value to the intergovernmental character of the PBC. The Chairs of the configurations are often left feeling too much alone in shouldering the responsibilities. The concept is that, in their meetings and their work generally, Chairs will be supported by appropriately ranked representatives from across the configuration membership who will bring authority and expertise to the table. If we are frank, we will recognize the gap between concept and current reality, and the PBC Chair said as much in his remarks here this morning. We need activist Chairs and activist membership. All of us, including those who have permanent seats on the PBC, might reflect on how we could better play our part.

Secondly, there is the question of the weight accorded to peacebuilding and, by extension, to the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) within the Secretariat. As in bureaucracies generally, a seat at the table has to be earned, but there also has to be a readiness on the part of others to make space. Despite improvements, there is a definite need for further steps to be taken to achieve a stronger and more coherent focus on peacebuilding within the Secretariat.

It is worth noting that in the original concept of the 2004 High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, the PBSO was envisaged as operating in association with a powerful new Deputy Secretary-General position. The co-facilitators of the review recalled that proposal but did not seek to revive it. However, as it now happens, our new Deputy Secretary-General is a person who was there at the creation. As President of the General Assembly at its sixtieth session, in 2005, Jan Eliasson played a key role in forging agreement on the PBC, and his speeches give eloquent testimony to the hopes that attended the birth of the new body. His involvement now from within the Secretariat can hopefully provide the impetus for some serious further thinking about how those hopes of 2005 can be better realized.

Thirdly, there is the question of interaction with the Security Council. The PBC 2011 report states that the relationship continued to develop during the reporting period but "there is growing recognition that additional efforts are needed on both sides to strengthen the relationship" (*S/2012/70, para. 24*). Despite the advances that the report acknowledges, it seems that a persistent, low-level mutual frustration continues to characterize the relationship between the two bodies, to the impoverishment of the deliberations of each. The growing recognition of which the PBC report speaks must be seized on, and the ideas put forward in the report, together with the United Kingdom paper and other inputs – including proposals made in a number of interventions here today – should provide a basis for concrete discussion.

This debate is hopefully the beginning of a new level of engagement on the part of the Security Council. There is need to move forward in a way that is both supportive and clear-eyed, recognizing the progress made but being frank about the distance to be travelled.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Ms. Hay (New Zealand): As an active participant in post-conflict peacebuilding efforts in our own Asia-Pacific region, New Zealand follows international discussions on peacebuilding with considerable interest. The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has provided a valuable tool for strengthening peacebuilding policy and practice across the United Nations system. Inevitably there have been teething problems, but the PBC can claim significant accomplishments during its first years. Today we need to focus on the PBC's positive potential.

Too often, international support for post-conflict States has been disparate and dysfunctional. The PBC has demonstrated a new model for engagement with such States, one that better integrates international support for addressing their development and security challenges. The PBC has also been a pillar of support for small, vulnerable States. Small States are overrepresented among the countries struggling to achieve development goals, and those afflicted by fragility and instability.

It is therefore not surprising that five of the six nations that have sought PBC assistance have been small States. The PBC has helped provide them with more consistent, integrated support.

The PBC's flexible, innovative working methods and its inclusive approach are particularly noteworthy. Through them it has engaged all parties needed at the table, involving interested States and relevant international organizations in its work in practical ways. Nor has it been jealously wedded to uniformity. Its configurations are tailored to the priority needs of the countries on its agenda; their work on the ground has been detailed and practical, with configuration Chairs making many in-country visits. By focusing on national ownership and national capacity-building in ways that the Security Council often fails to do, the PBC has been able to engage host countries on the basis of local realities, rather than the remote political perspectives that obtain here in New York. As a result, it generally avoids politicization.

In short, the PBC's working methods are well adapted to the practical needs of the complex situations it deals with, situations that were never foreseen in the Charter. As the Security Council reflects on its own working methods, it could benefit from drawing on lessons learned from the PBC regarding the practical benefits of more flexible and inclusive working methods. Enhanced dialogue between Council members and PBC configuration Chairs has been a useful first step, but much more can be done in that regard.

New Zealand is, however, concerned that a wide and dangerous gap is now apparent in the peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations. While the PBC is doing well with regard to its agenda, there are peacebuilding needs that would benefit from its attention but where a PBC country configuration is not possible. One way to address this would be to explore more varied, multi-tiered forms of PBC engagement, as recommended in the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. New Zealand would support the consideration of lighter options that could broaden the utility and appeal of the Peacebuilding Commission for post-conflict States.

The Council also has an important role to play. Current Council practice does not readily accommodate the inclusive, practical, sustained approaches required to tackle peacebuilding challenges effectively. For more than a decade, the Council has acknowledged, in numerous debates and statements, the need for better integration of peacebuilding and peacekeeping efforts in its work. We acknowledge the leadership of current and former Council members, such as South Africa and Brazil, in highlighting both the need for better integration of United Nations efforts and the dangers and expense of focusing solely or principally on peacekeeping tools.

But it is not enough for the Council to keep rediscovering this question in the abstract every few years. We must move forward to the consideration of innovative, practical responses tailored to specific cases. That may require new working methods that would enable Council members to interact with other United Nations bodies in order to better manage cases where both peacekeeping and peacebuilding are essential, but where the PBC is not able to assume primary responsibility.

Ensuring national ownership and building sustainable national capacities are core goals in post-conflict peacebuilding, and timely identification and deployment of appropriate civilian expertise are vital. Yet, the range of expertise required and the current inadequacies in the ability of the United Nations to identify, deploy and effectively utilize such expertise have severely limited its effectiveness.

New Zealand welcomed the Secretary-General's 2011 report on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (S/2011/527). We encourage its implementation by relevant United Nations bodies, including the PBC and the Security Council. Our success in such endeavours will have a material impact on the ability of the United Nations to meet the lofty goals it has set itself for supporting the development of effective national institutions.

The PBC can be proud of its achievements over the past six years. There is much that other United Nations bodies, including the Council, could learn from its flexible, pragmatic approach; but there is also clearly more that the PBC can do to fulfil its considerable potential. New Zealand will continue to play its part in our collective efforts towards that end.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Abdullah (Malaysia): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Madam President, on Colombia's

assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July.

I also wish to associate my statement with that made by the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Peacekeeping and peacebuilding are two sides of the same coin. The efforts of United Nations States Members to preempt violence and ensure stability and security for civilians have been well documented over the Organization's history. With more than 100,000 soldiers and civilians deployed in a host of peacekeeping missions, it is evident that peacekeeping and peacebuilding work will continue to be staples of United Nations efforts to ensure international peace and security.

The creation of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has been worthy of praise. While Malaysia values the role and functions of the Commission, we must also understand the need to be pragmatic in our approach to peacebuilding. The report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its fifth session (S/2012/70) gives a clear accounting of the Commission's activities and initiatives in 2011. In that connection, we note the report's suggestion that the need for greater interaction between the Commission and the Security Council is crucial and that efforts towards it should be intensified. More meaningful interaction, synergy of effort and coordination between the two United Nations bodies would only benefit stakeholders in promoting stability and peace.

At a higher level, the Commission's relations with other United Nations entities and with regional organizations could also be improved in order to encourage the sharing of related experience and capacity in post-conflict efforts. Additionally, intra-system relationships should be encouraged in order to enhance the coordination and interconnectedness between the PBC, the Peacebuilding Support Office, the Peacebuilding Fund and other related partners.

Malaysia realizes that peacebuilding requires financial support in order to build national institutions and strengthen governance in State development. In supporting efforts aimed at resource mobilization, it would be very helpful for the Commission to make increased efforts to interact with other possible partners. Such interactions would encourage the exploration of mutually beneficial possibilities and opportunities.

The Commission's current areas of activity should have the capacity to include other areas as it develops effective mapping models, in order to develop clear, credible programmes that include coordination on humanitarian assistance, reconstruction, governance and the rebuilding of public institutions. In that context, the Commission has taken the right step with its road map of action for 2012. However, it is essential that the road map be continually and consistently updated.

As I said earlier, Malaysia believes that the roles played by the United Nations in peacekeeping and peacebuilding are interrelated. In fact, considering the complex dimensions of many conflicts today, we believe that peacebuilding represents a complete system of conflict resolution. While peacekeeping is designed to restore security and stability, peacebuilding encompasses wider involvement in an array of equally important issues that include, for example, humanitarian relief and post-conflict reconstruction.

In post-conflict initiatives, the role of the international community in developing the economies of conflict-affected areas is pivotal for lessening the possibility of re-emerging wars, particularly since many of the parts of the world most affected by conflict are located in some of the world's most impoverished areas. It is therefore only logical to address the socio-economic well-being of the population in affected areas.

The formula Malaysia has consistently applied in post-conflict initiatives has always centred on socio-economic development and on building the capacity of local stakeholders. Through the Malaysian Technical Cooperation Programme, Malaysia has contributed to developing the capacity of Member States in need. We believe that such capacity-building programmes can contribute to resolving conflicts.

Malaysia's contribution to peacebuilding work does not end there. To support peacebuilding and humanitarian efforts, Malaysia also hosts the fifth and largest United Nations humanitarian response depot. The depot in Malaysia currently hosts 40 different international organizations operating throughout the region. Malaysia vigorously encourages Member States and other stakeholders to make full use of the depot in Malaysia as a regional hub for providing storage, logistics support and services to United Nations humanitarian agencies, international humanitarian organizations, and governmental and non-governmental

organizations, thus helping to strengthen their capacities for humanitarian, emergency and peacebuilding efforts.

Malaysia has been an active participant in international security and peacebuilding initiatives. In that regard, Malaysia hopes to achieve better interactions with the Commission, with members of the different configurations and their Chairs, and with other interested partners in generating capacity synergies. We wish to assure Member States that Malaysia will continue to be an active player and a reliable partner in international efforts to support peace and national rebuilding initiatives in post-conflict situations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Armenia.

Mr. Nazarian (Armenia): I would like to thank you, Madam President, for the opportunity to present our views on the subject of post-conflict peacebuilding. We also acknowledge the presence and statements of Her Excellency Minister of Foreign Affairs Holguín Cuéllar and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, and we thank both the outgoing Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Gasana, and the current Chair, Ambassador Momen, for their active involvement in addressing this important subject.

We share the views expressed by previous speakers calling for consistency in pursuing post-conflict peacebuilding and acknowledging our common responsibility for fulfilling commitments undertaken to support countries that have emerged from conflicts. Armenia is committed to post-conflict peace initiatives and strongly believes that the Security Council should further strengthen the rule of law and, in parallel, advance development initiatives.

That can be achieved by supporting peacebuilding mechanisms such as the Peacebuilding Commission, which helps countries emerging from conflict in their recovery and reconstruction efforts aimed at creating the foundations for durable peace and sustainable development. It is important that the PBC has shouldered the vital task for United Nations peacekeeping of defining post-conflict strategies. We find it encouraging that the recent report (S/2012/70) shows some promising results in some countries.

Regarding the relationship between the PBC and the Security Council, we believe that the two should work closely together, using each other's expertise and knowledge of the specifics of the situation on the ground to clearly identify priorities in order to make the most effective use of the limited resources allocated to peacebuilding efforts. For that relationship to be workable, the two bodies should try to be as flexible as possible, addressing the consequences of any conflict in a timely and efficient manner, since each conflict poses unique problems and requires specific solutions.

Although lessons have been learned and various approaches refined as the international community grapples with different approaches for dispute resolution, the tendency for a top-down approach persists, at times ignoring the specific context, roots and causes of a given conflict.

At the same time, we are of the view that we have not yet employed an essential resource that could bring us closer to sustainable economic development by creating opportunities for trade, investment and jobs, leading to engagement and solutions on the political front. One might question the value of embarking on the peacebuilding effort in a post-conflict situation while negotiations among the parties are ongoing. However, international experience shows that economic cooperation and interaction could be valuable confidence-building measures, often leading to political stability.

In order to achieve greater coherence in the region and to expand the geographic area of cooperation, the South Caucasus expects a coordinated and supportive approach and implementation of the various regional initiatives and programmes sponsored by donor countries and organizations. In addition, international financial institutions, as well as private sector contributions, should play a decisive role in moving towards that end.

We must recommit to such an approach and actively stay engaged also on the domestic level by promoting inclusive and accountable political processes. The post-conflict period offers a window of opportunity to provide basic security, deliver peace dividends, build confidence in the political process and strengthen core national ownership to spearhead peacebuilding efforts. Armenia therefore welcomes the Columbian initiative to hold this open debate, which is an opportunity to reflect on our past experiences and to highlight priority aspects in supporting countries' practical actions to lay down the foundations for sustainable peace and development.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia.

Mr. Khan (Indonesia): I commend you, Madam President, for convening this important open debate on the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2012/70). I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his remarks. My delegation also thanks Ambassador Richard Gasana and Ambassador Momen, the respective former and current Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for their useful statements. We also thank the other briefers for their presentations.

Indonesia aligns itself with the statement made by the representative by Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement caucus of the PBC.

Confronted with multiple challenges, countries emerging from conflict navigate a critical path that can lead to successful rebuilding and peace or a relapse into instability and violence. Which path it is depends primarily on the quality of nationally identified and nationally owned and driven peacebuilding. However, that quality, in large measure, also depends on the support of a robust and global peacebuilding architecture.

Indonesia is therefore pleased that, in a relatively short span of time, the PBC, its country specific configurations and the Peacebuilding Fund have progressed well and marked their status internationally.

As reflected in the report on its fifth session, the Commission's increased focus on the ground in the six countries on its agenda, its comprehensive approach and greater outreach and advocacy to the wider stakeholders have increased its impact at the country level. Thus, the role of the Security Council, as one of the parent bodies of the PBC, is crucial. The Council's support to the PBC and its utilization of the PBC's advisory role are highly beneficial. We are pleased that the Council is increasingly including the Chairs of the PBC configurations when the particular country situations are before it. The Council's stronger engagement with the countries on the PBC agenda, as well as with the other post-conflict countries considered by it, will also be useful.

Regular and meaningful cross-fertilization on fostering sustainable global peace and well-being among the PBC, the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, working within their respective mandates, is also very important. Indonesia fully supports it. I wish to make a few further observations as follows.

First, national ownership is critical. To foster that, it is vital that engagement frameworks and the support of the Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund, as well as international financial institutions, be in consonance with the nationally identified needs and priorities of post-conflict countries.

Secondly, the experience of the PBC has provided it with highly valuable knowledge and insights, which, apart from the Security Council, should be further drawn on the United Nations peacekeeping architecture, especially in relation to early peacebuilding tasks by peacekeepers. We should not be hesitant in drawing on each other's comparative advantages, and there should be greater interface among the PBC, international financial institutions and other relevant non-United Nations actors, as well.

Thirdly, in the ongoing review of global civilian capacities for countries emerging from conflict and those in transition, the PBC's advisory role, with its practical inputs on improving the United Nations system of harnessing and supporting civilian capacities, is highly important. We hope that the Commission will contribute actively to that exercise.

Fourthly, Indonesia strongly supports the focus on resource mobilization and partnerships, as contained in the PBC road map of actions in 2012. In that context, the outcome of the Task Force on the role of the private sector in post-conflict peacebuilding, which Indonesia had the privilege of facilitating in 2008, provided some very useful recommendations. We have repeatedly called for the PBC to further carry forward the various important recommendations therein. We are pleased that the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) has recently come up with a document that builds on a number of the Task Force's recommendations. We hope that those recommendations will be actualized.

Fifthly, in order to increase international attention and political support, disseminate best practices and build closer connections between the actors in New York and those at the country level, we have proposed that the PBC hold a dedicated annual session. The session should include relevant key governmental and non-governmental participants from all PBC Organizational Committee members and the PBC agenda countries, as well as from the United Nations system, such as the PBSO, the United

Nations Development Programme, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Field Support and the Department of Political Affairs.

As the world's third largest democracy, and having gone through its own transition to a well-functioning democratic State, Indonesia bears witness to the different challenges and opportunities for building peace. As we have directly seen the fruit of national capacity development, we firmly believe in it. Indonesia has achieved major reforms in many areas, including the rule of law, inclusive political processes, elections, media development, civil society participation, good governance and human rights.

We are keen to share, and have shared, our experience and expertise with others in the global South and to learn from the experiences of others. Thus, enhanced regional, South-South and triangular cooperation is a key part of Indonesia's efforts to support the capacity development of countries affected by conflict and those in transition.

In closing, Indonesia expresses its strong determination to continue to steadfastly supporting the PBC and to play its role in realizing even more strongly supported and robust responses from the PBC.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Norway.

Mr. Wetland (Norway): The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was intended to play a crucial role as an intergovernmental body that can engage the world community in supporting States in their peacebuilding processes. In that regard, the PBC has certainly brought more sustained attention to the countries on its agenda, which could otherwise easily have fallen below the radar screen. However, after four years of service at the United Nations, it surprises me that each time I ask colleagues what, in their view, is the core of peacebuilding, I receive different answers. It is clear that the PBC is still struggling to define its role. We need to continuously ask ourselves how we can make sure that that intergovernmental body can bring added value, not only added numbers of documents and processes. We have a common responsibility in addressing that challenge.

One of the overarching recommendations from the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture was to enhance the interaction between the Commission and the countries concerned, in order to ensure genuine impact in the field. The way we see it, the country-specific configurations could work primarily as a support group for the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and the United Nations country teams, and refrain from becoming an additional administrative layer.

The review also stressed the need for better cooperation between the PBC and other actors, including the Security Council. There has been some progress, but we need to further accelerate that work. We would also like to highlight the common meeting of the Organizational Committee of the PBC and the Executive Board of UN-Women in which one of the conclusions was to initiate country-specific discussions on the progress and challenges of integrating women into peacebuilding.

We value all the work on resource mobilization that has been done, in particular in the country-specific configurations. Norway will continue to provide more than 1 per cent of our gross national income in development aid. We do so also as a challenge and encouragement to new partners and emerging Powers to increase their support. Indeed, the challenge is also extended to currently underperforming but potentially large donors. Let me stress that we are pleased with the broadening of the donor base in the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF).

The Fund's focus on countries low on the donor radar, its swiftness, its willingness to take risk and its large donor base constitute the Fund's main strengths and added value. Furthermore, considerable progress has been made in establishing the PBF as an effective and accountable funding mechanism. We note that the Fund will need to work harder in order to attain the goal of a 15 per cent allocation focused on women's specific needs. We look forward to rapid progress in that regard.

Last year, Norway made a new $5 million contribution to the PBF for the year 2011. I am pleased to formally announce that we will provide the same amount for 2012. The improvement in the management of the PBF has been important for us. But we are also very much aware that, if we want to focus on results and strict measures against corruption, there is a need for the PBF to take risks. The risk of failing to engage in areas in conflict far outweighs most of the risks — if we are honest about our efforts — of our collective but modest engagement.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Khalil (Egypt): Egypt would like to align itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

I also wish to thank His Excellency Mr. Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Permanent Representative of Bangladesh, the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, and Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana, the outgoing Chair, for their statements.

The post-conflict peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations brings together security and development actors to promote common, integrated and mutually reinforcing approaches to building and sustaining peace. That multifaceted nature of post-conflict peacebuilding implies certain challenges. Among the most important of those challenges is, first, building the national capacities of post-conflict countries, which should be at the centre of all of our efforts to achieve sustainable peace and prevent conflicts from relapsing. In that context, Egypt would like to recall its initiative to establish an African Union centre for post-conflict reconstruction and development.

Secondly, establishing a nexus between peace and development by consolidating the culture of peace will lead to stability as a cornerstone for sustainable economic development.

Thirdly, there is the challenge of intensifying national ownership to guarantee that peacebuilding programmes are responsive to the actual needs of each country and consequently harmonize the interaction between United Nations Headquarters and the peacebulding missions on the ground.

One of the most important aspects for the Peacebulidng Commission is the growing interest in its work on the part of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. That presents a good opportunity for the Commission to act as a liaison between the main United Nations organs, other agencies within the United Nations system and the international financial institutions to establish a more effective mechanism for resource mobilization to strengthen the Peacebuilding Commission and enhance its role in achieving sustainable peace and development in the countries on its agenda.

To conclude, I would like to reiterate the importance of the lessons learned from past experiences in the countries that are on the Commission's agenda. They represent an invaluable asset for the Commission that should be utilized in the future. I would like also to assure the Council that Egypt remains ready to provide its civilian expertise for peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict according to General Assembly resolution 66/255.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. Okafor (Nigeria): On behalf of the Nigerian delegation, I would like to thank you, Madam President, for convening this important meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding. I would also like to thank Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen, Permanent Representative of Bangladesh and current Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), and Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana, Permanent Representative Rwanda and former Chair of the Commission, for their statements, which provided fresh perspectives on the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission.

My delegation would also like take this opportunity to thank the Chairs of the various country-specific configurations for their untiring efforts in channelling assistance to the countries on the Commission's agenda, as well as the Peacebuilding Support Office for being a critical success factor in the global peacebuilding efforts.

Nigeria fully aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, but nonetheless would like to underscore a few issues of interest to my delegation.

Today's debate is indeed an opportunity to assess the progress and challenges of our collective effort to support peace and socio-economic development for countries emerging from conflict. Well before the inception of the PBC, Nigeria undertook efforts to support post-conflict peacebuilding in various countries in Africa, especially in West Africa. The lessons from that experience motivated Nigeria to convene the open debate on preventive diplomacy in the Security Council in July 2010 (see S/PV.6360). It reflected our concern that the scale and scope of the new forms of conflict and the ever-present risk of relapse were outpacing our collective ability to respond effectively to conflict.

After six years of the existence of the PBC, post-conflict peacebuilding remains a fragile but promising undertaking. Recent developments in some

countries on the PBC's agenda have underscored the fact that peacebuilding requires a more integrated approach that encompasses political inclusiveness, security, human rights, economic development and the rule of law.

My delegation would also want to highlight four major challenges that have an impact on peacebuilding efforts.

First, our individual and collective commitment to the activities of the Peacebuilding Commission, especially in the country-specific configurations, must be supportive and result-oriented. Our experience to date proves that both the participation in the mandate of the configurations and the willingness to contribute are more rhetorical than actual.

Secondly, the commitment of members must extend beyond mere interest. It should be reflected in their desire to share experiences and provide technical and financial contributions. Three days ago, the Organizational Committee of the PBC discussed a paper on resource mobilization for peacebuilding priorities prepared by the Peacebuilding Support Office. The paper identifies specific actions that the Chairs and members of the country-specific configurations can take to advance their work on resource mobilization. It offered a menu of 42 options in resource mobilization for the PBC to carry forward in the implementation of this critical mandate. The PBC must now rise to the challenge by focusing on some pertinent options in order to advance its work on resource mobilization for countries on its agenda.

Thirdly, there has been much talk about the expectations that the Security Council has for the PBC. This debate is therefore an opportunity for Council members to clearly spell out what those expectations are and how the PBC should meet them, including by meeting periodically to examine progress in fulfilling them. In saying this, we recognize that the founding resolutions assigned the PBC three critical tasks: political accompaniment, advocacy and support; resource mobilization; and fostering coherence among various stakeholders. The tasks are clear, but the expectations relating to their delivery remain a matter for continuing dialogue.

Fourthly, peacebuilding is essentially about enhancing the capacity of the affected country to meet all the challenges of peacebuilding on its own. The role of the PBC and of the Security Council is to ensure that their engagement with the countries on the agenda results in a strengthening of the capacity of these countries to undertake the task of peacebuilding on their own. This is in line with the principle of national ownership, which is becoming increasingly central to debates on post-conflict peacebuilding.

As a member of the PBC Organizational Committee, Nigeria remains committed to supporting the integrated peacebuilding strategies of the Commission. It is our fervent hope that this debate will provide new insights into and impetus for enhancing post-conflict peacebuilding activities. We are also determined to work in concert with other stakeholders to ensure that this impact is felt positively.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of South Sudan.

Mr. Nazario (South Sudan): I thank Colombia for convening this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. I would also like to thank the outgoing and current Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) for their statements and the representative of the World Bank for his valuable contribution this morning.

The Republic of South Sudan appreciates the opportunity to share its views with the Security Council on the issue of post-conflict peacebuilding, which is the essence of what we are trying to achieve as a young nation. We have much to learn from such debates, as the experience of others may help us to forge ahead with our own development goals.

As the Council is aware, the Republic of South Sudan marked its first anniversary a few days go, on 9 July. The Republic of South Sudan faces the challenge of ongoing negotiations with the Republic of the Sudan on border demarcation and the final status of several disputed areas. South Sudan has also experienced episodes of intra-tribal conflict with deep historical roots, some of which is also politically motivated. Both of these are drivers of fragility in our young nation.

My Government's primary objective is the establishment of a sustainable peace so that all the people of South Sudan can have a life of dignity. To achieve this, we must conclude our negotiations with our neighbour, the Republic of the Sudan, in a way that produces a lasting agreement. We must also strengthen the capacity of our institutions to deliver services, respect the rights and privileges of our people, provide protection to all civilians and promote national healing.

We welcome the recent decision of the Council to renew the mandate of the United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS), and we welcome in particular the support provided by UNMISS to strengthen our institutions.

In situations as complex as that in which South Sudan finds itself, the challenge is always to identify priorities, coordinate the required work and apportion resources accordingly. We look forward to continuing to partner with the United Nations and other development and humanitarian partners in these important prioritization and coordination efforts.

In this regard, we welcome the Council's call in resolution 2057 (2012) for a coordinated approach between the United Nations Mission, the United Nations country team, United Nations agencies, and multilateral and bilateral donors in support of national State-building and peacebuilding strategies. We look forward to working in partnership with the United Nations, international financial institutions and bilateral donors to build our institutions, strengthen the rule of law and ensure that the human rights of all South Sudanese are fully respected, in accordance with South Sudan's own development priorities, as articulated in the South Sudan Development Plan. We would also welcome a dialogue with the PBC on these complex coordination challenges in order to establish whether there is a need to coordinate further our comprehensive and interlinked peacebuilding efforts.

It is important for the Government of the Republic of South Sudan to reiterate that the decision to shut down its oil production was taken with a deep sense of responsibility towards the people of South Sudan. In the light of the clear evidence that shipments of South Sudanese oil were being seized illegally and the fact that payments dating back to July 2011 had been withheld, the temporary halting of production was necessary, despite the sacrifices it has entailed, in order to ensure a just outcome for the people of South Sudan in the longer term. We are currently operating on an austerity budget due to the loss of our oil revenue, and we are looking at other mechanisms to diversify our economy. This may take some time to develop, but we remain steadfast in our wish to achieve sustainable economic growth for our people as a way to consolidate peace.

In our endeavour to continue security sector reform, we place special emphasis on the professionalization of the police, correctional services and the judiciary, as well as the provision of greater access to the justice system. The Republic of South Sudan is determined to establish sound institutions, the rule of law and a multiparty democratic system of governance.

The Government of the Republic of South Sudan also believes that no conflict can be resolved without an inclusive process, and we do not deny that a lot still needs to be done. It is only through the inclusion of all parts of society and their joint contribution towards our common goal that peace will be achievable. We look forward to continuing to work together with our many partners and friends to achieve this vision.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of Nepal.

Mr. Acharya (Nepal): I wish to begin by thanking you, Madam, for organizing this open debate and chairing this meeting on the important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding. It shows your strong support for the cause.

I thank Ambassador Gasana of Rwanda, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), and Ambassador Momen of Bangladesh, the current Chair, for the presentation of the report (S/2012/70) and their valuable statements.

Peacebuilding has come to the centre stage today as a result of the changing landscape of global peace and security.

The United Nations has a responsibility and an opportunity to act swiftly and effectively in the assistance of the countries emerging from conflict in order to make sure that peace, development and the protection of human rights become sustainable there. That is possible only when we ensure them due priority, promote focused and coordinated attention, and enhance support in a sustained manner. We are all aware that the Peacebuilding Commission was established in 2005 to address their special situation and needs in a more coordinated manner.

No matter how fragile the situation may be, it is very important that we build and promote national leadership and ownership in such countries. Peace can be made sustainable only by building and strengthening it. In the aftermath of conflicts, devastation is widespread and frustrations are rampant. The available resources are meager and institutions are non-functional or weak. This is the context in which peacebuilding-related work has to extend support for political processes, the rule

of law and justice, and basic delivery of services and economic revitalization, all at the same time and in a very coherent manner. The traditional approach does not work there effectively.

It is in that specific context that, as the representative of a country that expresses its support for the PBC, that I should like to dwell briefly on the questions that have been so pertinently raised in the concept paper before the Council (S/2012/511, annex).

The Peacebuilding Commission is a unique body because of its composition and mandate. It derives its strength from being an intergovernmental body to ensure a coordinated, coherent and integrated approach to post-conflict peacebuilding activities in the countries on its agenda. While there is a constant evolution of peacebuilding strategies based on the specific situations in the field, we have yet to use its full potentialities for effective peacebuilding. Ensuring political attention and support on a longer-term basis, and coordination and coherence among all stakeholders around the nationally developed, owned and implemented peacebuilding strategy highlights the added value of the PBC. Similarly, it should have wider and deeper consultations with the regional and subregional organizations.

The Security Council should support more systematic, substantive and institutionalized consultations with the PBC on the countries on its agenda. Better and robust coordination, coherence and collaboration at the field level, among the United Nations operation agencies and other regional and international organizations is what we are all looking for. Similarly, there should be a synergy of activities with a similar level of coherence at the headquarters level.

As to the political and structural tools of the PBC, Organizational Committee and the country-specific configurations are working hard to enhance the level of attention and provide more coherence among all relevant stakeholders at headquarters and field level respectively. But there is a long way to go. The role of the Organizational Committee could be made more active and dynamic with frequent and structured meetings with other United Nations bodies and the Bretton Woods institutions, including other interested stakeholders, at Headquarters level to mobilize both political and financial support. The Chairs of the configurations must be fully supported by the Organizational Committee, the Security Council and the General Assembly by initiating institutional consultations to draw upon their first-hand experiences in dealing with peacebuilding challenges in the field. Synergy between the PBC and the Peacebuilding Fund are sine quo non for the effective utilization of the Fund. The Working Group on Lessons Learned should also be fully utilized to look at the best practices from the field and disseminate and adopt such proven practices, wherever possible, for the effective implementation of peacebuilding activities. We need to bridge gap between expectations and delivery on the ground.

On the role of the Member States in empowering the PBC, it is indeed up to us, the Member States, to make the Commission an effective intergovernmental institutional mechanism to extend sustained support for peacebuilding. A higher level of engagement is critical. Several studies have underscored the fact that timely, sustained and adequate resources for the well-targeted activities are critical to making peacebuilding efforts a success. Moreover, we have heard from the field that if the PBC is to have more influence on the ground, it should be supported strongly to generate wider and sustained interest in the countries under its agenda. Results on the ground are what we are all looking for.

Member States should come forward with a renewed commitment to supporting the work of the Peacebuilding Commission by providing necessary financial resources for the nationally owned peacebuilding strategy. The PBC should also play a catalytic role in making available civilian experts in economic planning, judiciary reform, health, education and economic revitalization, including infrastructure development as per the specific needs of the country on the PBC agenda. These investments would pay off greatly in the form of domestic political stability and economic prosperity, which provide a very strong foundation for regional and international peace and security.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Mr. Estremé (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I should like to congratulate you, Madam, on the Colombian presidency of the Security Council this month, and to thank you for convening this open debate.

In the context of their responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the United Nations and the Security Council in particular

have a key role to play in organizing support to countries emerging from conflict, building lasting peace and laying the foundations for sustainable development. We believe that it is no exaggeration to assert that this is one of the main challenges now facing the international community and the Organization.

As highlighted in the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture (S/2010/393, annex), an effective response on the part of the Organization requires a broad, coordinated strategy that is based on the priorities identified by local authorities and establishes goals and specific timetables. This task requires the development of humanitarian, political and security activities and assistance, the restoration of the rule of law, the promotion of development and the protection and promotion of human rights. This is a major task.

In considering this issue, I wish to highlight the following three key aspects. First, my country reiterates its conviction that peacebuilding is essentially a national task and responsibility. It is clear that the support of the international community is essential in addressing reduced or destroyed local capacities following a conflict. International, regional, subregional and non-governmental organizations have a central role in developing institutional capacities, but they must always do so throughout the reconstruction process on the basis of the involvement, guidance and priorities established by local authorities. That will ensure an agreed approach that allows the root causes of a conflict to be addressed in a more effective and legitimate way. In that regard, we welcome the prioritization of national capacity development in the Commission's work, as stated in the report on its fifth session issued in January (S/2012/70).

Secondly, we stress that the role of coordinating all international peacebuilding assistance must be played by the United Nations. That role has not always been fully assumed, yet it is critical to ensuring the success of peacekeeping and peacebuilding alike. As my delegation has said in the Council on other occasions, in particular with reference to the situation in Haiti, the United Nations must concentrate the coordination of international efforts to ensure peacebuilding, with particular emphasis on the priorities established by the authorities of the beneficiary country, with the aim of reducing, in an organized and phased manner, the presence of the international community until it is no longer needed. The ability of local authorities to exercise their institutional capacity to assume their own responsibilities will be the gauge of the success of the Organization's work.

Thirdly, I stress the fundamental role played by regional and subregional organizations in accordance with Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, and the need to enhance the capacities of regional systems to support countries that are recovering or emerging from conflict. In that context, the United Nations has a no less important role to play, given its unique ability to mobilize financial, technical and political resources for peacebuilding activities and to establish synergies with regional and other international actors, ensuring that all such efforts contribute to the goal of strengthening institutions and accord with the priorities of the country concerned.

To conclude, Argentina is convinced that the United Nations has the crucial responsibility to support countries emerging from conflict, working with local authorities, regional organizations and other players, in order to achieve reconstruction, strengthen institutions and avert the possibility of a relapse into conflict. As is pointed out in the concept paper submitted by the Colombian delegation for today's debate (S/2012/511, annex), there can be no doubt that it is in political accompaniment, resource mobilization and fostering coherence that the added value of the Organization can be found.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Sudan.

Mr. Osman (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I congratulate the delegation of Colombia on its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month.

Peacebuilding is the only guarantee for countries emerging from conflict against relapse into hostilities. In recent history, there have been numerous examples of countries falling back into conflict for various reasons, most important of which were poor judgment and the absence of good governance. In that regard, we recall the plans of action set forth by the Secretary-General in 2009 and 2010 on the issue before us today.

Although two years have elapsed since the most recent report of the Secretary-General (S/2010/386), we are still working to develop a United Nations integrated strategic approach through its peacekeeping missions in post-conflict countries, its country offices,

national Governments and relevant international financial agencies and organizations so as to meet the pressing needs that arise in the immediate aftermath of conflict, including capacity- and institution-building; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; the return of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) to their homes; and mine clearance.

In that regard, the delegation of the Sudan welcomes the participation of the representative of the World Bank in today's meeting, as well as the attendance of the representative of the Islamic Development Bank.

The most recent report of the Secretary-General highlights two new priorities in post-conflict peacebuilding: domestic and transnational organized crime, including drug trafficking, and disputes over natural resources, which regrettably have become one of the main causes of relapse into conflict, rather than the lynchpins of peace and development in countries emerging from conflict. In that regard, we recall the round table meeting organized by the Peacebuilding Fund on 22 November 2011, attended by representatives of some countries emerging conflict, the private sector – particularly the mining industry – non-governmental organizations and several international experts. The meeting emphasized the emergence of the aforementioned priorities as challenges in numerous countries emerging from conflict.

In addition to the two priority issues cited in the report of the Secretary-General as being threats to peace, my delegation would add the issue of financial corruption, which is plaguing some countries emerging from conflict and an important cause of relapse into conflict, instability and suffering for the people of those countries. In addition, countries emerging from conflict need rational political decision-making. It is unacceptable for a country to take decisions that aggravate the suffering of its people simply because it does not want to abide by international standards of economic and commercial relations.

We stress the importance of the role played by the Peacebuilding Commission and recall that its establishment – the culmination of difficult and prolonged negotiations during the 2005 World Summit held as a follow-up to the Millennium Summit, at which the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were adopted – provided a shortcut towards the concrete achievement of peace on the ground through long- and short-term programmes designed to respond to immediate post-conflict needs. We would also recall the close interrelationship between peace and development as two basic complementary components.

National ownership and the sovereignty of States are among the important aspects that have to be taken into consideration in the implementation of post-conflict programmes and projects, as is the important role of international organizations, such as that of the African Union in the Sudan and other African countries.

In that context, my country, the Sudan, with all its broad experience and management ability, will seek peaceful and positive solutions to the issues now being negotiated in Addis Ababa between the Government of the Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan. Accordingly, I would remind the Council that the Government of the Sudan, committed as it is to peacebuilding in the newly established Republic of South Sudan, has allowed that State to transfer its oil through Sudanese territory, facilities, supply lines and ports for an entire year without charging a single dollar in exchange. When the Republic of South Sudan did not respond by paying the internationally agreed fees, we were compelled to act to protect the sovereignty of our land and prevent the waste of our resources.

With regard to the Sudan, just as it played a commendable role in implementing the Comprehensive Peace Agreement with the State of South Sudan, I should like to say that our experience in peacebuilding has come a long way in implementing the Doha Document for Peace in Darfur once the Darfur Regional Authority, which was established by that Document, assumed its functions. That has made it possible to enter the peacebuilding stage. Now that voluntary repatriation has been put in place throughout the territory, it is incumbent upon the international community, United Nations specialized agencies and the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur to coordinate with the Regional Authority in order to leverage the greatest amount of resources and capacities to support peacebuilding projects in Darfur and ensure stability in the region. We also call upon the Security Council to take the necessary measures vis-à-vis those who reject peace and continue to impede peace and security in Darfur with the support of some neighbouring States, who themselves need stability more than others in order to address the needs of their peoples.

In conclusion, responding to the challenges of peacebuilding will not be possible unless there is support for sustainable development from donors and the international financial institutions, in particular the World Bank and other multilateral partners. That is all the more so given the fact that experience has shown — such as at the Oslo donors' conference following the 2005 signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement concerning South Sudan — that donor pledges at the conflict and peace-making stages tend to be very promising. However, regrettably, once the war come to an end and the implementation of the Peace Agreement and its programme began, the actual response in fulfilling the commitments made fell short of expectations, and was sometimes absent altogether.

I should also like to recall the importance of providing diversified sources of funding to the Peacebuilding Fund in order that it can respond immediately to urgent needs that cannot be put off.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There are no more speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.